

THE
CHRISTIAN EXAMINER
 AND
THEOLOGICAL REVIEW.

VOL. V.—No. IV.

JULY AND AUGUST, 1828.

CONTENTS.

MISCELLANY.

- Letter to the Rev. Parsons Cooke. . . 277
 On the Occasion, Object, Contents,
 and Date of St Paul's Epistle to the
 Galatians. 285

- POETRY.—To H— 234

REVIEW.

- ART. IX.—Vindication of the Rights
 of the Churches of Christ. First
 printed in the Spirit of the Pil-
 grims. 298
 ART. X.—The future Punish-
 ment of Infants not a Doctrine of
 Calvinism; 2. The Future Pun-
 ishment of Infants never a Doc-
 trine of the Calvinistic Churches;
 3. On the Future State of Infants;
 three Letters addressed 'To the
 Editor of the Christian Examiner,'
 and published in 'The Spirit of the
 Pilgrims' for January, February,
 and March. By the Rev. LYMAN
 BEECHER, D. D. - - - - - 316

NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

- Channing's Installation Discourse 341

- Dabney's Annotations 343
 Morgridge's Discourse 345
 Peabody's Address 345
 Walter Scott's Religious Discourses 346

INTELLIGENCE.

Correspondence of the American Unitar-
 ian Association, on the State of Unitar-
 ianism, 347—in Franklin County, 347
 —Bristol County, 348—Essex County,
 349—Essex County, (south eastern
 part), 350—Plymouth County, 351—
 Bristol County, 351—Worcester Coun-
 ty, 351—Hampshire County, 352—
 Unitarian Ministers, 352—Theological
 School in Cambridge, 353—Unitarian
 Mission in Bengal, 353—Installation at
 Charlton, 361—Installation at Salisbury
 and Amesbury, 361

VIEW OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS.

Russia and Turkey, 361—Greece, 362—
 Portugal, 362—South America, 362

OBITUARY.

Henry Hill, Esq. 363

BOSTON,

PUBLISHED BY BOWLES & DEARBORN, 50 WASHINGTON STREET.

LONDON, BY JOHN MILLER, AMERICAN LIBRARY, 40 PALL MALL.

LIVERPOOL, BY EDWARD WILLMER, 25 LORD STREET.

Hiram Tupper, Printer—Bromfield Lane.

1828.

CHRISTIAN EXAMINER.

THE price of subscription for this work is three dollars a year, payable on the delivery of the second number, on the 20th of April.

THE four volumes of this work now published, or either of them, or single numbers, may be obtained of any of the Agents, at the subscription prices; viz. Vols. I. and II. at \$2, and Vols. III. and IV. at \$3, and the numbers in proportion.

Complete sets handsomely half bound in Russia or common calf, can be had of the Publishers in Boston.

✍ If Authors, Editors, or Publishers will send copies of their works to the Editor, Boston, they shall be either Reviewed, Noticed, put upon the List of New Publications, or Advertised upon the Covers.

Preparing for Publication,

THE DRAMATIC AND OTHER WORKS OF JOANNA BAILLIE.

First American Edition.

THE Editor has received from the Author of these celebrated works, some additional matter, which, it is believed, will now be published for the first time. This edition will comprise the play just published in England under the title of 'THE BRIDE,' and is intended to be a complete collection of Miss Baillie's Works.

A Prospectus giving more particular explanations on the subject of the proposed publication, will shortly be issued.

Preparing for Publication,

A Collection of the Writings of the Rev. William Ellery Channing, D. D. with some additional matter now first published.

This Collection will make a large octavo volume, which is to be stereotyped upon a new pica type, and printed with all convenient despatch.

Third Separate Edition.

In the press, and will soon be published,
Remarks on the Character and Writings of John Milton, occasioned by the publication of his Lately Discovered Treatise on Christian Doctrine, from the Christian Examiner for 1826. Third Separate Edition. In one Volume, 18mo. of about 150 pages, beautifully printed on fine paper.

THE
CHRISTIAN EXAMINER.

VOL. V.—No. IV.

JULY AND AUGUST, 1828.

MISCELLANY.

TO THE REV. PARSONS COOKE.

[The following letter, originally intended to have been sent directly to the person to whom it is addressed, was occasioned by the publication of a sermon entitled, 'Unitarianism an Exclusive System, or the Bondage of the Churches that were planted by the Puritans. A Sermon preached on the Occasion of the Annual Fast, April 3, 1828. By PARSONS COOKE, Pastor of the East Church, in Ware.' This pamphlet contains, besides what is noticed in the letter below, a reiteration of the false charge of persecution against the Genevan Church of the present day, which, after all that has been published to set the matter in its true light, it is difficult to believe is repeated in ignorance of the facts in the case, but which, if not so repeated, is as disgraceful to its propagators as the conduct they without reason ascribe to the Unitarians of that city; for it is the circulation of a false statement for the meanest of all purposes which can be entertained by a party to a controversy the single end of which should be the establishment of truth—the purpose of fixing upon antagonists an odium which does not in any way justly belong to them. It is of a piece, however, with all the rest of this specimen of the spirit of Orthodoxy, and is by no means so distinguished for its grossness above the ordinary character of the sermon, perhaps, as to have merited even this passing notice.]

REV. SIR,—

I received some time ago a copy of a sermon preached by you to your congregation in Ware, on the occasion of the Annual Fast of this year, which happened a few days before the general election for this Commonwealth.

As this discourse was avowedly designed to rouse your people

to a due exercise of their political rights, and to a sense of the importance of attending to the religious character of the candidates for office, it was without doubt well calculated to produce that effect, and probably had an influence on the suffrage on the ensuing Monday.

Had its office there ceased, I do not know that it would have been proper for any one without your parish to have taken notice of it, or made any inquiry whether your unqualified charge of designed partiality to a class of Christians to whom you would refuse the name, by all the departments of the government, Executive, Legislative, and Judicial, was founded in truth, or was a mere gratuitous assumption necessary for the object you have in view.

Whether a minister preaches true or false doctrines in theology, morals, or politics, to his peculiar people, is a matter between him and them, with an appeal finally to the Great Being in whose name he undertakes to speak.

But this sermon has been printed in a form for extensive circulation, probably with a view to make it one of the tracts of your party, and has been somewhat uncourteously sent by you, or some of your friends, to those public officers whose public conduct is therein most unjustly arraigned. Entire silence on their part will, I have no doubt, be very shortly construed as an acknowledgement of the truth of its representations, and, in your next appeal to the public, will probably be taken as proof of admission by those who hold office, that the spirit of exclusion, which you have altogether without grounds attributed to them, has been exercised in the manner you have alleged.

Far be it from me to accuse a minister of the gospel of wilful misrepresentations; for, however unceremonious your attack upon the characters of all whom the people have chosen to entrust with their most important temporal concerns, I feel too much respect for your sacred office to admit the supposition that you knew what you advanced to be untrue; but from the less heinous, though quite as mischievous fault of preaching and publishing injurious aspersions without inquiring whether they were true or false, I cannot acquit you. Whether zeal in support of what you think a good cause will justify this, probably in your opinion, venial sort of libel, is a matter of morals, if not of religion. In my opinion it concerns both.

I am told you are a young man recently settled under the influence of a very honest, but not very intelligent gentleman, who is notorious for his spirit of proselytism to what he con-

siders the only true faith; and under this impression I make some allowance for that bold denunciation of all the constituted authorities of the State, which ought to subject a more practised clergyman to severe animadversion.

It is no light matter to charge the three great departments of the government with an abuse of their trusts for the worst of purposes, that of discouraging religious men and excluding them from office. This, however, you have done openly, and circulated the charge extensively. You cannot, I think, complain, if one who thinks himself slandered, should endeavour to convince the public that the charge is untrue. If that charity which thinketh no evil, is not offended when a man of holy office libels the appointed civil rulers of the land, surely that which beareth all things will allow the calumniated to raise his voice in selfdefence.

To make a sermon from the sacred desk a vehicle of abuse against the civil fathers of the State, may entitle you to great praise among those who would overthrow the institutions by which the State is upheld, in order to erect on their ruins a power, which by you and them may be deemed a blessing, though in all ages it has been found a curse; but the wise and the good will consider your effort a perversion of your influence and office to the worst of purposes; and if the character of this people is not strangely mistaken, they will see in your attempts, what in other times would be considered portentous of great trouble to the Commonwealth.

It is not my design to examine minutely your discourse—the general temper and character of it are sufficiently objectionable without entering into details. I shall merely select a few passages for comment, in which I cannot but think, in addition to the bad spirit they breathe, there is a manifest want of decorum towards those whom, as a christian minister, telling his people that the powers that be are ordained of God, you were bound to respect.

You say in page 6, ‘for a specimen of this manœuvring, just recur to the manner in which the offices at the disposal of the Executive, have been distributed.’ By whom are these offices filled? By the Governor and Council. They then have been guilty of this manœuvring. And for what purpose? Why, to exclude from office all who do not ‘give proof of their hostility to the religion of their fathers.’

Now this is a serious charge—and so far from being true, that it requires charity to believe that you yourself did not know it to be false.

Was Governor Strong in this plot, concerned in this manœuvring? He was always claimed by the Orthodox as belonging to that party, and yet the three Judges of the Supreme Court, who are supposed to be heretical, were all put into office by Governor Strong, and the only one of that bench supposed to believe in the religion of the fathers, was placed there by the heretical Governor Lincoln. But there was manœuvring in this, you suggest in a note, but do not explain why and how. I put it to your conscience, Reverend Sir, whether that note was not written merely because you found the fact of that appointment would go far to disprove the proposition you started with, that the Executive in its appointments has been influenced altogether by the exclusive sectarian spirit. But the Judges of the Court of Common Pleas are all of this exclusive sect. Who placed these gentlemen on that bench? Governor Brooks. Was he a man to be concerned in manœuvring in the exercise of the most important branch of his duty? Did he require that they should 'give proof of their hostility to the religion of their fathers?' One would think it were enough for a minister of religion to reproach and slander a living Governor, without disturbing the ashes of those who have gone to their account, and whose praise, when living, was in all the churches, as well as among the people.

But not only the Governor and Council have for a series of years been violating their duty and their oaths, abusing their trusts for the base purpose of advancing one sect of Christians, and humbling another—the Legislature itself, the representatives of the people, have partaken of the same spirit, 'has been pursuing measures of the most exclusive sectarianism.'—'For many years our Legislature have in all matters that in any way related to religion, manifested an exclusive spirit. Acts of incorporation and patronage have been withheld from literary institutions for no other reasons than their Orthodoxy.'

Is this true? Did you, Sir, believe what you preached? From what literary institution has incorporation been withheld? You mean the Amherst College. Do you not know, Sir, that the chief opposition to this was from the Orthodox, and that because it was thought injurious to another Orthodox College? Do you not know that the incorporation was finally carried by the votes of the Liberal party, and that nearly all the Boston members, all heretics, voted in the affirmative?

But you say 'Trustees of the Liberal class, have been thrust into the management of a college, endowed exclusively from Orthodox benevolence.' Ask President Humphreys if he did

not declare at the hearing before the General Court, that this college was to have nothing exclusive in its character—if he did not eulogize Harvard College, its institutions and instructors. Was this all to get the act of incorporation through, or was it sincere? If sincere, how can they now complain that such men as Judge Howe, Judge Lyman, Samuel Allen, and Governor Lincoln have been elected into their boards?

Having thus traduced the Executive and Legislature, this reverend champion of the religion of peace, charity, and order, next assails the Judicial department. 'The same sectarian spirit has *profaned* the temple of justice'—and then he charges the supreme tribunal of justice with confiscating the property of churches, robbing the altar of its furniture, &c.

No body of men unclothed with the vestments of religion, no individual however passionate, or vulgar, has ever used such language as this towards any even the lowest of our Courts of Justice. It was reserved for this meek minister of our meek religion, to arraign in this vituperative style a tribunal which has ever enjoyed the confidence of the community. And for what? For a painful exercise of duty on a subject coming before them in the ordinary course of their business, more than eight years ago, and acquiesced in by the public ever since. I say acquiesced in; for eight successive Legislatures have had their sessions twice a year since, and yet no one has remonstrated against the decision, or endeavoured to procure an alteration of the law. Is this the way for citizens of this Commonwealth—for ministers of the gospel, to conduct themselves when dissatisfied with a decision of our courts? Is this the way to teach submission to the powers that be? Why not apply to the Legislature to declare all churches corporations, and give them the right to control the consciences and the purses of the people of a congregation as they once had? Why not procure an alteration of the Constitution, and abolish that article of the Declaration of Rights, which secures to each religious society the right to contract with and elect its own ministers?

Why quarrel with the Court for deciding that some half dozen members of a large congregation shall not usurp dominion over the whole, and if they find resistance, shall not carry out of the temple the furniture and utensils which belong to them only as a part of that congregation? If this, being declared to be law, is inconvenient or unjust, why not, as in other cases, apply to the Legislature for relief? But the Legislature is in the plot, the Governor and Council are confederate with the Judges and the Legislature. How strange that all the world should conspire

against so meek and humble a spirit as Orthodoxy, and all this, too, owing to the criminal indifference of the Orthodox themselves, who, in spite of all this cruelty and persecution, will keep choosing men to rule over them, who are thus combined to oppress and destroy them!

But this is not all. Harvard College brings up the rear of the formidable enemies to the true faith. Lo! it was once Orthodox and is now Liberal—once blind and now can see. So one of these days it may be said of Amherst itself, if free inquiry should be allowed, as it was intended to be, if President Humphreys declared the truth respecting it.

This is a stale complaint about Harvard College. It was as Liberal when Doctor Pearson and Doctor Worcester educated their sons there of choice, as it is now; and the same Professor of Divinity was as much of a Universalist then as now. Reverend Sir, let me modestly ask whether you wrote and preached without a blush, the sentence in which you say that *Universalism* is taught by the Professor of Divinity of that College? Did you never read his solemn denial of the fact—his earnest call for the name of the person who charged him with it? Did you never observe the shuffling conduct of the Recorder upon the occasion? Pray tell me, who am not a casuist, is the whole system of morals discarded from the Orthodox theology? Are false assertion, calumny, concealed but active poison, lawful weapons in spiritual warfare? Is abuse of public agents, seditious appeals to the people against the government, open reviling of the law, sanctioned by the Calvinistic creed? Is the old maxim of the Jesuits, that all means are lawful to promote a good end, admitted by you in theory as it seems to be in practice? If so, you are consistent; if not so, you disparage the cause you would maintain. And here allow me to say that I cannot but think that the wise heads of your party had rather you would not have come out, at least so soon. They are not prepared for battle, and there is some danger, that the victory may be lost, by the too eager and premature onsets of some of their inexperienced subalterns.

I cannot leave you without a passing notice of your ingenious perversion of the text prefixed to your discourse—‘The powers that be, are ordained of God.’ Let me ask you candidly, Whom did the apostle intend by the ‘powers that be,’ the people or their rulers? Was he recommending respect for the laws and for those who make and administer them, or was he exciting the people to jealousy and dissatisfaction against those set over them in the Lord? After you have answered this question to

yourself, let me ask you another—Is your discourse a fair commentary upon the text, or is it a subtle abuse of it?

It cannot but be amusing to remark your wailing for the persecuted sect to which you belong. What! the proud Orthodox minister, who excommunicates all who dare think otherwise than he thinks, boasting that two thirds or more of the community are of the same faith with him, who says to the highest in the land, 'Stand off! I am holier than thou!' who denies christian fellowship and the name of Christian to the wise, the learned, the great, because they dispute his dogmas—does he belong to a poor, despised, and persecuted sect? So did the Pontiff when he shook the thrones of princes, and palsied the hearts of armies.

One thing which seems to perplex your mind, I think may be easily explained. How is it, you say, that with a vast majority of the people on your side, yet time after time, year after year we see successive Governors and Legislators taken from the ranks of the enemy? It is because the people are more enlightened, more liberal, more just than their ministers; because they do not make a party affair of their religion; because they can discern merit, value integrity, make use of talents, although their possessors may differ from them on points of theology, which none but those interested in gaining or preserving power can deem essential to the Christian. And it is this temper that ought to caution you, and others who set you on, or uphold you, that as soon as you unfurl the flag in an ecclesiastical warfare, deserters from your ranks will be sufficiently numerous to destroy your boasted majority.

I have done with you and your sermon for the present. If you think you are dealt harshly by, remember that, without any provocation and without any decency, you have assailed the actions and the motives of your temporal superiors—the whole government of your country—not the present only, but the successive Governors and Legislatures for years; that you have charged the Judges with corruption, partiality, sacrilege. There was a time when the whole civil power would quail under such a denunciation. That time is gone by. He ought to quail who utters it.

TO H—.

SWEET child! that wasted form,
 That pale and mournful brow,
 O'er which thy long, dark tresses
 In shadowy beauty flow—
 That eye, whence soul is darting
 With such strange brilliancy,
 Tell us thou art departing—
 This world is not for thee.

No! not for thee is woven,
 That wreath of joy and woe,
 That crown of thorns and flowers,
 Which all must wear below!
 We bend in anguish o'er thee,
 Yet feel that thou art blest,
 Loved one! so early summoned
 To enter into rest.

Soon shall thy bright young spirit,
 From earth's cold chains be free;
 Soon shalt thou meet that Saviour,
 Who gave himself for thee!
 Soon shalt thou be rejoicing,
 Unsullied as thou art,
 In the blest vision promised
 Unto the pure in heart!

Yes! thou art going home,
 Our Father's face to see,
 In perfect bliss and glory!
 But we, oh! where are we?
 While that celestial country
 Thick clouds and darkness hide,
 In a strange land of exile,
 Still, still must we abide!

O Father of our Spirits,
 We can but look to thee!
 Though chastened, not forsaken,
 Shall we, thy children be.
 We take the cup of sorrow,
 As did thy blessed Son—
 Teach us to say with Jesus,
 'Thy will, not ours be done!'

A.

ON THE OCCASION, OBJECT, CONTENTS, AND DATE OF
ST PAUL'S EPISTLE TO THE GALATIANS.

It appears from the accounts we have of the first preaching of Christianity, after the death of our Saviour, that it was considered as intended for the Jewish nation alone. The apostles themselves, notwithstanding the instructions of their Master, seem for some time to have had no idea of Christianity as a universal religion, except in so far as it might be extended to the Gentiles, on the ground of their becoming incorporated with the Jewish nation, through circumcision and conversion to Judaism. Jesus was considered as exclusively the Messiah of the Jews, and the benefits and blessings of his kingdom, it was thought, were to be extended only to the Jews, or those who embraced the Jewish religion. That this was the case, appears from the history of the conversion of Cornelius, the conduct of Peter on that occasion, and the surprise manifested by the rest of the church at Jerusalem, at this event.

When therefore St Paul preached Christianity to the Gentiles, and baptized them into the name and religion of Jesus, without requiring the observance of the Mosaic law, a violent opposition was excited against him, his preaching, and the course which he pursued, by some of the Jewish Christians, who are supposed to have been of the sect of the Pharisees. Many of these had spread themselves abroad, had crept into the churches of Christians which had been formed among the Gentiles, and declared to them, that, except they were circumcised and adopted the observance of the Mosaic law, they could not be saved, or enjoy the benefits of the Messiah's coming. Besides the direct account of these teachers in the fifteenth chapter of the Acts, and the notices of them in the epistles to the Romans and Galatians, there are allusions to them in others of St Paul's epistles; as, probably, Philippians, ch. i. 15;—'Some indeed preach Christ even of envy and strife;' and ch. iii. 2;—'Beware of dogs, beware of the concision,' as it is rendered in the common version. There is also clear proof of the jealousy and distrust which was felt towards St Paul by the Jewish Christians, on account of his preaching among the Gentiles, in the Acts of the Apostles, particularly in chap. xxi. 20;—'And when they heard it, they glorified the Lord, and said unto him [Paul], Thou seest, brother, how many thousands of Jews there are who believe, and they are all zealous for the law; and they are informed

of thee, that thou teachest all the Jews who are among the Gentiles, to forsake Moses, saying that they ought not to circumcise their children, neither to walk after the customs.'

It appears from the Epistle to the Galatians, that the Judaizing teachers by whom Paul was opposed, had invaded the churches of Galatia, had acquired influence among the new converts, and were endeavouring to persuade them to submit to circumcision and the other ritual observances of the Mosaic law, as necessary under the gospel. St Paul says, ch. i. 6, 'I marvel that ye are so soon removed from him that called you into the grace of Christ,' to the blessings of Christianity, 'unto another gospel.' Ch. iv. 9, 'Now after ye have known God,' after having been instructed in true views of the character and will of God, 'are ye turning again to the weak and beggarly elements,' that is, those imperfect principles of religion, 'whereunto ye desire again to be in bondage, and are observing days and months and years.' Ch. iii. 3, 'Having begun in the spirit, are ye now made perfect by the flesh?' Here the spirit, or spiritual religion of Jesus, is contrasted with the flesh, or less spiritual religion of Judaism, and the meaning may be expressed by rendering the passage thus;—'Having begun with what is spiritual, would you be made perfect by what is not spiritual?' Ch. iv. 21,—'Tell me, ye who desire to be under the law,' &c. Ch. i. 7,—'There be some, that are troubling you, and would pervert the gospel of Christ.'

Under these circumstances St Paul wrote his Epistle to the Galatians, to prevent them from listening to the arguments and teachings of the Judaizing Christians, or submitting to the yoke and bondage of the Mosaic law. His object in this Epistle is to repel the doctrine of these false teachers, to declare the true conditions of acceptance with God, and enforce and illustrate to the heathens who had been converted to Christianity, the doctrine of justification by faith without the works of the law; or the doctrine, that, under the christian system, a man is justified, that is, accepted by God, considered righteous in his sight, admitted to his favor, by the reception of Christianity and adopting it as the rule of life, without the observance of the rites and ceremonies, or works, of the Mosaic law. The language used by him is very strong, and his opposition to the Jewish teachers vehement and determined, as it was of great importance that correct views should be entertained on this subject. For the doctrine of the Jewish teachers was not only unsanctioned by Christ, but inconsistent with his instructions and contrary to the spirit of his religion. It was changing the character of his religion, a substitution of a superstitious observance of ceremonies for piety and virtue, answering in its essential features

to other substitutions which men have made of false religion for true, and thus rendering Christ of no effect.

Again, the doctrine which St Paul opposes, was taught by unauthorised teachers, by men not commissioned by God, or Christ, to preach Christianity, who were opposing him who was so commissioned, and, by their preaching, attaching to Christianity a useless and pernicious incumbrance, which would impede its progress, prevent it from being generally adopted, and thus defeat the purpose of its author. For these reasons he does not represent it merely as an unnecessary and burdensome yoke, but declares to them, that, if they are circumcised, Christ will profit them nothing, that every man who was circumcised was a debtor to keep the whole law. 'Christ is become of none effect unto you whosoever are justified by the law; ye are fallen from grace;' that is, If you are circumcised, if you adopt the doctrines your teachers propose, you are giving up Christianity, it is of no benefit to you. If you hope for acceptance on the ground of the observance of the law, you have abandoned Christ; you have fallen away from favor.

It appears also from this Epistle, that the Jewish teachers had urged, that the apostles at Jerusalem considered the observance of the Mosaic law as necessary, that they endeavoured to disparage the authority of St Paul, representing him as only a deputy of the church at Jerusalem and of the other apostles, and that they pretended that his doctrine was to be regarded of authority, only in so far as it coincided with that which they ascribed to the other apostles and the rest of the church. St Paul, therefore, in the beginning of the Epistle, declares strongly his separate authority, and asserts, in the two first chapters, his independence of the rest of the apostles, having received his knowledge of doctrines from direct revelation. With this purpose in view, he gives an account of his conversion and subsequent conduct. It appears also that the Jewish teachers represented St Paul as having changed his opinion, or as holding it loosely and insincerely, and asserted or intimated that when absent from Galatia, he preached circumcision and the observance of the Mosaic law, as appears from ch. i. 10;—'Do I now seek to please men,' i. e. do I seek to conciliate the favor of men, by preaching circumcision? 'For if I yet pleased men, I should not be a servant of Christ;' also ch. v. 11,—'and I, brethren, if I still preach circumcision, why do I yet suffer persecution? Then were the offence of the cross done away, or ceased.'

The principal facts, which will serve to explain the Epistle, then, are these. 1st. That the churches in Galatia were com-

posed in great part of those who had been converted from heathenism to Christianity. They were probably formed by St Paul on his first apostolical journey ; for, although no mention is made of his visiting Galatia until his second apostolical journey, Acts, xvi., it seems most probable, from the way in which it is mentioned there, that the church had been formed previously by Paul and Barnabas, on their first journey through Asia Minor.* This is moreover rendered probable, by the mention of Barnabas, in the Epistle, as one known to them, who, it appears from Acts, xv. 39, parted from Paul previously to his second apostolical journey.

2d. That the new converts had received the gracious doctrines of the new religion, the glad tidings of Christianity, with great joy and eagerness, and testified great affection for St Paul personally ; that in a short time, however, some of the Jewish Christians, who contended for the necessity of the Gentiles' adopting the Jewish religion, had gone among them, by their teaching and misrepresentation had acquired great influence, and induced many to submit to the observance of the Mosaic ritual, and to despise the authority of St Paul ; that they had created dissensions and animosities among them, and conducted themselves in a licentious and disorderly manner. St Paul controverts their doctrine, asserts and vindicates his authority, refutes their false statements about himself, and affectionately exhorts the Galatians to purity in their conduct, to keep themselves from the evil influences of the doctrines and example of the false teachers, and to stand fast in that liberty wherewith Christ had made them free.

A synopsis, or general and connected view of the contents of the Epistle, will serve to assist us in the understanding of it.

St Paul, since his authority had been disparaged by the Jewish teachers, begins the Epistle by strongly asserting it to be separate and independent, not derived from men, but by divine appointment ; ' An apostle not of men, neither by man,' &c.† He then, in the sixth verse, reproaches the Galatians with having fallen away from the gospel he had preached among them ; ' I marvel that ye are so soon removed from him that called you into the grace of Christ, to another gospel.' He expresses, in the eighth and ninth verses, his firm adherence to the doctrines he had preached among them, and his conviction of their truth, and pronounces an anathema upon himself, or any other, who should preach a different doctrine. In the tenth verse he declares that

* See Acts, xv. 36.

† St Paul's address here, will be observed to be very similar to those at the commencement of his other epistles, except in the peculiar strength with which, on account of his peculiar circumstances, he asserts his apostolic authority.

he preaches, without regard to the prejudices of men, those doctrines which he had received, (verse 12), not of man, or from human instruction, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ.

He then goes on to give an account of his conversion and the course which he pursued subsequently, showing that from having been a persecuting Jew, he had become a zealous and independent apostle of Christ ; relates his several visits to Jerusalem, his conference with others of the apostles, and the manner in which he was received by those of them who were high in estimation in the church, and states that the course which he had pursued, and the manner in which he had preached Christianity, had not met with their disapprobation or censure, but on the contrary that they had given him and Barnabas the right hand of fellowship ; and speaks of his uniform resistance of all attempts of the Jewish teachers to infringe upon the liberty of Christians. In the eleventh and following verses of the second chapter, he gives an account of his reproof of Peter for his conduct at Antioch, in seeming to favor the notions of the Jewish Christians with regard to the Gentile converts. He had asked him, it seems, why he would compel the Gentiles to live as Jews, when by his preceding conduct he had shown that he did not consider it necessary. He then gives his reasoning with Peter. We ourselves, he said, who were born Jews, knowing that it is not by the works of the law, the observance of the ceremonies of the Mosaic law, that a man is justified, obtains the favor of God, becomes a good man, but by faith in Jesus Christ, the belief and reception of Christianity,—have believed in Christ, that we might be justified thereby, and not by the works of the law. If we, therefore, while we seek to obtain the favor of God through Christ alone, that is, as Christians, are ourselves found to be sinners by giving up the law, as Peter's conduct would seem to imply, then Christ is the minister of sin. God forbid, he says, that we should admit this, for it is a fundamental doctrine of Christianity, that the law is abolished. And he had further told St Peter, * that if he attempted to reestablish and build up what he had himself thrown down, he thereby declared himself to have been a transgressor, referring to St Peter's former neglect of the law. St Peter, it seems, before the Jewish Christians came to Antioch, had neglected the observance and requisitions of the law, by eating with the Gentiles ; but after that, from fear of offending those Jews who came down to Antioch, and who held to circumcision and the strict observance of the law, he

* Though St Paul speaks, in the eighteenth verse, in the first person, it is evident from the connexion that he refers to the conduct of Peter.

withdrew himself from them. For this, for appearing to favor those prejudices, which, by his previous conduct, he had shown he disregarded, St Paul reproved him.

The object of the apostle in these two first chapters, after vindicating his authority, is, to repel the charges of looseness and insincerity in his conduct, and to show that, since his conversion, his conduct and sentiments with regard to the point in question, had been uniform and consistent, and his opposition to all attempts to impose the observance of the law upon the Gentile converts, determined and unyielding.

In the third chapter he proceeds to argue against the necessity of observing the Mosaic ritual. His first argument is, that they had received the spiritual blessings they enjoyed, by their instruction in the gospel, and not by the works of the law. 'Did ye receive the spirit,' that is, spiritual blessings, 'by the works of the law, or by the hearing of faith?' He asks them, if, having begun with the spirit, with what is spiritual, they would be made perfect by the flesh, that which is less spiritual, or the Mosaic law, this being a term often applied to Judaism or the Mosaic law, by Paul. He then tells them that as Abraham had faith in God, and it was accounted to him for righteousness, that is, he was accepted with God, or treated by him as a righteous man, so they Christians, as Abraham's children, were admitted to the favor of God in the same way. In opposition to the belief of the Jews, that, as the natural descendants or children of Abraham, they enjoyed the favor of God, he represents those as designed to enjoy this favor, who are the *spiritual* children of Abraham, who resemble him in faith, or are Christians. And in opposition to those who maintained that it was not enough for the Gentile converts that they were Christians, but that it was also necessary to adopt and observe the Mosaic law, in order to obtain the favor of God, he represents those who are under the law, as under a curse. For those who are under a law, and depend upon the strict observance of that for God's favor, are required to keep the whole law, in order to be entitled to its blessings, and any failure in observing it; subjects them to its penalties—a failure in a single article makes void the claim to acceptance upon the ground of mere law. The language of a law is the language of requisition. 'If you appeal to the law,' his argument runs, 'you have no claim to favor without observing the whole law; the promises of mere law are to perfect obedience only, and its threatenings to the slightest neglect.' To support what he says, the apostle, in the eleventh verse, quotes a passage from the Old Testament; 'The just shall live by faith,' the good

man shall be blessed through his faith; 'but,' he says, 'the law is is not of faith,' is not of the nature of faith, but its language is that of absolute requisition. 'The man that doeth these things shall live by them.'

It may be observed that St Paul's remarks do not apply to those who were under the law before Christianity, but to those who set up the necessity of conformity to it since the introduction of Christianity. Christ, the apostle says, had delivered them, by his ignominious death, from the curse of the law, that the blessings promised to Abraham might be enjoyed by the Gentiles through Jesus Christ; that they might receive the promised spiritual blessings through faith. He then takes an example from the dealings among men in common life, to show that the law did not annul or set aside the promise made to Abraham, an objection which might be made by the Jews. As in the ordinary transactions of life, a contract between man and man, when once ratified, cannot be altered or set aside by anything subsequent, so the law, which was given four hundred and thirty years after, could not annul the promise made to Abraham, so as to make it of none effect.

Vs 18. For if the inheritance, that is, of the blessings of the Messiah's coming promised to Abraham, were claimed upon the ground of the law, upon the ground of having and observing the law, if it be attached to the observance of the law, then it ceases to be in consequence of the promise. But, he says, God did promise it gratuitously to Abraham.*

Vs 19. He replies to an objection which the Jews might make to the representation he had given of the law—'Wherefore then serveth the law?' For what was the law given, what purpose did it answer, the Jew might ask, if your representation be true? To this he answers that it was given on account of transgressions—nothing which they could glory in, of which they could make their boast; but, on account of their tendency to transgression, to be a restraint upon their wickedness until the seed should come to whom the promise was made—until the days of the Messiah.

Vs 19. 'It was ordained by angels' &c. that is, the law was introduced by the ministry of angels, 'by the hand of a mediator,' that is, Moses. 'Now a mediator is not of one, but God is one.'

* We may remark that, in the sixteenth verse, St Paul makes a distinction between two different classes of Abraham's descendants. 'Now to Abraham and his seed &c.' First, the Jews or the natural descendants, and second, the Christians or spiritual children, who were so because they resembled him in faith. He says the promised blessings were intended only for one class of descendants, that is, the Christians, and not for both. For a more full explanation of this passage, Gal. ix. 15, 16, see *Christian Examiner*, vol. v. p. 60.

There are different explanations of the meaning and design of this obscure passage. One is, that St Paul's purpose is to contrast the law as having been communicated to Moses by the ministry of angels,* with the promise to Abraham given immediately from the Deity†—and the apostle's argument is, that the law was not immediately from God, but through angels, by a mediator. For a mediator acts not for an individual, a mediator is not of one, but for a collection or body—But God is one. ‡

The apostle then compares the law with the gospel, or dispensation of faith, and represents the condition of those under the law as far inferior to that under the gospel. The law, he says, was not capable of producing that righteousness and holiness and blessedness which God wills—but when they were under its dominion, they were under restraint and bondage as children under a tutor, the law being given to prepare them for the more gracious conditions which were to be revealed in the gospel, the glorious liberty of the sons of God. 'For ye are all children of God,' he says, 'by faith in Jesus Christ; for as many as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ,' or obtained the blessings imparted by Christ. There are no distinctions, he says, in Christianity. There is neither Jew nor Greek &c., referring to the distinction which the Jews insisted upon, but, being Christians, they are all equally Abraham's posterity and heirs of the promise.

Chap. IV. In the beginning of the fourth chapter, Paul continues the comparison he had before used, of their situation before becoming Christians, to that of children, who, while children, are under the restraint of tutors and governors, and differ in nothing from servants, being in bondage. But when the fulness of time was come, he continues, God sent his Son Jesus, to deliver those who were under the law, that they might become truly the sons of God, entitled to all the blessings and privileges of sons, and enabled, by the spirit of his Son, to look up to him as their Father. He then, in vs 9, reproves them for wishing, after enjoying these glorious privileges as Christians, and having been blessed with those views of the character and will of God which Christianity gives, to return to their former imperfect views of religion, those weak and beggarly elements,

* It was the opinion of the Jews that the law was given by the ministry of angels. See Acts vii. 53.

† A similar comparison of the law with the gospel, is given in Hebrews, ii. 1, 2.

‡ A different explanation of the passage in the text is given by Locke. A mediator acts between two parties. Now God is but one, and as Moses was not commissioned by the other party, viz. the seed of Abraham, the promise to Abraham cannot be set aside by the law.

to which they had formerly been in bondage, and to which they seemed desirous again to subject themselves, by superstitiously observing days and months and seasons and years.

In vs 12, he entreats them to be like him, to imitate his freedom from the Jewish prejudices, and reminds them in the following verses, of the affection and kindness they had formerly testified toward him, and contrasts the sincere love and interest for their highest welfare which he felt, with the narrow, selfish, and interested views of the Jewish teachers.

In the 21st and following verses he appeals to those who desired to be under the law, with an allegory drawn from the Old Testament, a mode of reasoning common among the Jews.

In this, he says, the two children of Abraham, by the freewoman and the bondwoman, represent the two classes of his posterity, the Christians, and those who adhere to the law, or Jews. As the son of the bondwoman was born in the common course of nature, so the Jews were the natural descendants of Abraham; but the Christians were in a spiritual sense the descendants of Abraham according to the promise, corresponding to Isaac who was born in consequence of a promise. The bondwoman corresponds to Mount Sinai, or the covenant of the law given from Mount Sinai, and to Jerusalem which is now in bondage with her children. But the Jerusalem which is above, is free, and the mother of all Christians; and as the son of Hagar persecuted Isaac, so now the Jews, who correspond to the son of Hagar the bondwoman, persecute the Christians, who correspond to Isaac the son of the freewoman, born after the Spirit, or in consequence of the divine promise. He then quotes a passage from the Old Testament; 'Cast out the bondwoman and her son, for the son of the bondwoman shall not be heir with the son of the freewoman,' to show that the Jews, who adhered to the law as the ground of acceptance with God, were to be rejected from the inheritance of the blessings of Christianity.*

Chap. V. The apostle then goes on to exhort those to whom he wrote, to stand fast in this liberty wherewith Christ had made them free, and declares to them, in the strongest manner, that by submitting to circumcision and the Jewish law, and making that the ground of acceptance with God, they in fact abandoned Christianity, rejected the blessings it offered them, and had no hold upon its promises.

* See an explanation of St Paul's design and reasoning in this passage, in the *Christian Examiner*, vol. v. pp. 61, *et seq.*

In the seventh and following verses, he alludes to the pernicious influence which the false teachers were exerting among them. In the eleventh verse he repels the false statement which had been made concerning him, that he was preaching circumcision; 'for,' he says, 'if I do still preach circumcision, why do I still suffer persecution?' that is, from the Jews. 'For then were the offence of the cross ceased,' that is, what is offensive to the Jews in the christian doctrine, would cease to exist.

In the remainder of the chapter he guards against any misapprehension of his meaning in what he had said of christian liberty, and cautions the Galatians against an abuse of the glorious liberty to which they had been called, showing that it does not consist in exemption from the laws of virtue and morality, and freedom to indulge in licentiousness, and exhorting them to a spiritual, or true christian life, exhibiting the difference between that and a carnal, or sensual life, or the life after the flesh.

In the beginning of the sixth chapter he exhorts them to kindness, affection, and good will to one another. In the seventh and following verses he seems to have reference to the licence of morals in which the false teachers, or some of the community, indulged themselves. In the twelfth verse he again alludes to the selfish and interested views of the Jewish teachers in wishing to subject them to the Jewish law, to acquire credit and authority among them, and glory in their weakness—'But,' he says, 'God forbid that I should glory save in the cross of Christ,' and concludes with the usual salutation.

Of the period of St Paul's ministry to which this Epistle is to be referred.

There is a great diversity of opinion among critics with regard to the date to be assigned to this Epistle. There are no certain grounds on which to determine this point. The opinion usually adopted, is, that it was written a short time after the Council at Jerusalem, mentioned, Acts, xv. 1-7, where the subject of debate was the same as that discussed in this Epistle. The occasion and object of this Council is thus related in the Acts. 'And certain men which came down from Judea,' to Antioch where Paul and Barnabas then were, 'taught the brethren, and said, Except ye be circumcised after the manner of Moses ye cannot be saved. When therefore Paul and Barnabas had no small dissension and disputation with them, they determined that Paul and Barnabas, and certain others of them, should go up to Jerusalem unto the apostles and elders about this question.—And when they were come to Jerusalem,

they were received of the church and of the apostles and elders, and they declared all things that God had done with them. But there arose up certain of the sect of the Pharisees who were believers, saying that it was needful to circumcise them, and to command them to keep the law of Moses. And the apostles and the elders came together to consider of this matter.'

This journey of St Paul from Antioch to Jerusalem, on the business of the Gentile converts, related in the passage just quoted, has been generally supposed to be the same as that mentioned in the second chapter of the Epistle, and, upon this ground, it is supposed that the Epistle was written after the Council. But there are strong objections to this opinion, and some reasons which seem to render it more probable that it was written before the Council. For, first, if we compare the account of the journey to Jerusalem mentioned in the second chapter of the Epistle, with the account in the Acts of that on the business of the Gentile converts, we perceive such a difference as renders it highly improbable that they were the same, upon which supposition the other opinion in great measure rests.

1. In the Epistle St Paul says that he went up by revelation; in the Acts we read that he was sent by the church at Antioch.
2. In the Epistle he represents his visit as a private one, and says that, when he went up to Jerusalem, he communicated that gospel which he preached among the Gentiles privately to them which were of reputation, which differs from the account in the Acts. But the great difficulty in supposing the Epistle to have been written after the Council, arises from St Paul's making no mention of the deliberation, or the decree, which was the result of the Council. It seems in the highest degree improbable, that, when writing on the very subject which was discussed at the Council, he should not have appealed to the decree, or taken notice of it in any way. On the contrary, his manner of writing seems to show, that his views and opinions had not yet received the formal sanction of the apostles at Jerusalem; for he begins with asserting his independent authority, and speaks of his independence of them, and of his difference with Peter in this affair, in such a manner as to intimate plainly, that, if the apostles had not openly differed from him, they certainly had not given their opinion publicly in favor of his views.

Again, the false teachers would not have *so openly* opposed the doctrines of St Paul after the Council; and there is no evidence that they did so after this event, from any of his epistles which were clearly written subsequently. Moreover, the conduct of Peter at Antioch, related in the second chapter of the

Epistle, which took place after the journey, and, according to the other opinion, after the Council, is unaccountable upon the supposition, that the decree, in promoting which he is represented in the Acts as having taken so active a part, had been passed before. It is highly improbable that he would have changed his opinions or his feelings so soon. The manner in which St Paul speaks of him, shows clearly that he was not countenanced by him; and there would have been no necessity for St Peter's pursuing the course he did, after the active part he had taken at the debate a short time before. We may add also that there was nothing to be gained by him as a matter of condescension. His real opinions could not be concealed. For these reasons, it seems most probable that the Epistle was written before the Council. There are no means of determining the precise time. It is probable that it was written at Antioch, during St Paul's long abode there, mentioned at the end of the fourteenth chapter of the Acts, where, after relating the return of Paul and Barnabas to Antioch, it is said that they abode there a long time with the disciples. St Peter, we are told in the Epistle, came down to Antioch after St Paul's journey to Jerusalem, which will agree well with the supposition that the journey taken was at that time. Those mentioned in Acts xv. 1. as coming down from Jerusalem, may be the same as those referred to in the Epistle—'When certain came down from James.' It may be placed, then, a short time after this, in the disputes which then took place, and before the Council. Upon this supposition, therefore, it was written first of all St Paul's Epistles.

The Epistle to the Galatians is to us of the greatest interest and importance. It shows the state of feeling and opinion with regard to the nature and spirit of our religion, which prevailed among its first followers, and in the earliest stage of its existence. It shows us the disputes and differences which then agitated and divided Christians, and the grounds with regard to them taken by the different parties, and illustrates the style of reasoning and state of feeling prevalent among the ancient Jews. On one side we see the Jewish Christians, who had adopted, indeed, the religion of Jesus, but who understood and imbibed its spirit but imperfectly, with that zeal for the rites of their ancestors, and the sacred and venerable institutions of Moses, with that jealousy of the Gentiles and of the extension of Jehovah's favor to them, which has ever distinguished their nation, striving to attach to Christianity a heavy incumbrance, which threatened to obstruct its progress, to defeat its purposes of carrying peace and happi-

ness to all nations, of purifying the gross corruption and wickedness of mankind, forming them to purity and holiness, and fitting them for the enjoyments of immortal beings. On the other hand, we see one, who had also been educated a Jew and of the strictest sect, but who had imbibed the spirit of our religion, and was informed of its true nature and excellency, casting off all the feelings and prejudices in which he had been educated, and contending, with the utmost force and earnestness, for the immunity of the converted heathen from the bondage of ceremonies, for their equal and unconditional participation in the blessings and benefits of the Messiah's kingdom, and exhibiting our religion in its native purity and simplicity. We see him, sometimes in the language of indignant remonstrance, and sometimes of affectionate entreaty, appealing to the Jews with arguments drawn from their sacred scriptures; laboring to inculcate upon the heathens converted from idolatry, the true nature of Christianity, to free it from the corruptions which were already beginning to gather round it; teaching that the religion of Jesus was not one of forms and ceremonies, to be confined to a favored few, but one of universal application, intended for the blessing of the whole human family, the purification of the whole moral world, and declaring that in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth anything nor uncircumcision, but a new creature.

The controversy between St Paul and the Jewish teachers, was of the highest importance to the interests and efficacy of Christianity, as intended to guide and regulate the moral conduct of mankind. It was a controversy between true and false notions of religion, between a religion of the heart and life, and one of mere forms and ceremonies. In the religious history of mankind, we observe a tendency to substitute the observance of external rites, for the more difficult and laborious exercises of selfdenying virtue and internal purity; to rest their hopes of the favor of God upon certain definite and established forms, rather than impose upon themselves the constant vigilance and restraint, which are necessary for the regulation of the internal character, and the proper cultivation of the heart and affections. Those ordinances, which have been appointed as means of moral improvement, for occasional memorials of our religious duties, to assist our imperfect virtue and excite our devotional feelings, have been substituted for the effects they were intended to produce. While these means have been scrupulously adhered to, the end for which they were instituted, and for which alone they are of any value, has been lost sight of. What is only incidental has been superstitiously adhered to, to the neglect of what is essential; and unrequired

ceremonies have taken the place of piety and virtue. The tendency of this is obviously to defeat the end of religion. This was the state of the Jewish religion at the time of our Saviour ; it was against this corruption that a great part of his instructions were directed, and to correct these erroneous views was the object of much that he said and did. It is a similar corruption of Christianity that St Paul opposes in this Epistle to the Galatians. The Jewish teachers were endeavouring to load Christianity with an incumbrance of forms and ceremonies, to change its character, to lead men to regard the superstitious observance of certain external forms, as of the highest importance and as essential to acceptance with God—to place their hopes of his favor in the observance of the ritual of the Mosaic law, rather than in purity of heart and virtuous conduct. When we consider this, we shall not be surprised at the warmth and earnestness with which St Paul opposes their doctrine and combats their pretensions.

B.

REVIEW.

Art. IX.—*Vindication of the Rights of the Churches of Christ.*
First printed in the Spirit of the Pilgrims. Boston, Pierce
 & Williams, 1828. 8vo. pp. 48.

A PERIODICAL work of the most bitter and malignant spirit, reviving and exaggerating all the exasperating sentiments and language of the departed Panoplist, has recently made its appearance in Boston. Whatever may be its professions, its real purpose is, to awaken a war *ad internecionem*, a war of extermination against all Christians, who do not belong to the dominant sect. It is precisely in the spirit avowed by Dr Ely of Philadelphia. 'No man,' says Ely, substantially, 'is to be eligible to any civil office, who does not subscribe to the doctrines of the five prevailing sects.' By this, we are to understand, that there is to be a combination among the most powerful sects, to seize the civil power, and the use they may hereafter make of it, is to be sought in the calamitous history of Christendom for the last fifteen hundred years. No man is to be elected into any office of honor or trust, who is not a *believer* ; by which these gentlemen exclude every man who does not think as they do, on the subject of religion. It would be hypocritical in us to pretend that

we feel any apprehension that these men of violence will succeed—we do not call them fanatics, because that term is exclusively applied to those who have lost their reason, whose zeal is too powerful for their understanding. But our aspirants to universal domination in church and state, are a very cool and calculating people. They will not, like the Scottish Covenanters, inconsiderately risk their lives or even fortunes for their theories, but they coolly and cunningly seek the attainment of their great purpose, which is *power*—power of the most enticing, yet most fatal character to the welfare of a state or nation ; power over the opinions of men on the most interesting and important of all subjects. In fact—we must not disguise it, the times require a fearless avowal of the truth—there is no power in its own nature so despotic, there is no power, against which human wisdom, intelligence, and industry are of so little avail, there is none which is so tremendous in its effects on the happiness and prosperity of states, as the theological power. It enslaves and debases the mind, and has led, and will forever lead to civil despotism. The successful conqueror will find it for his own interest to encourage the prosperity of a state. The theological tyrant feels, that his power can only be secured by debasing the human mind, and he always seeks an alliance with the civil power more effectually to accomplish his ends.

No man, even the most Orthodox or Exclusive, will deny, that such has been the tendency of Papal usurpations in every country of Europe. Richelieu, Ximenes, Mazarin were the firmest supporters of despotism. Loyola founded a sect, whose avowed purpose was, to govern all the thrones of Europe, and to degrade their subjects into slaves. What was the object ? To promote the power of the sovereign, and the welfare of the state ? No—to tyrannize over both. What has impeded the efforts of the Spanish nation to redeem their character and their rights ? The clergy, an unprincipled and domineering clergy. What encouraged Don Miguel to overthrow the liberal Constitution of Portugal ? The clergy. What has been the bane of the South American States, since they have thrown off the Spanish yoke ? An ambitious body of clergy. What then would you infer from this ? that Christianity is unfavorable to civil liberty, and to the improvement of the human character and condition ? God forbid ! Our only inference is, that *men love power* ; and that even Christianity itself, pure as it is, humble as its first professors were, will not always divest men of their worst, and most dangerous passion, the love of power—a passion, which, if indulged, is the most dangerous, most absorbing, most injurious

to the welfare of mankind of any to which frail and fallible humanity is subject.

But it will be said, 'Your examples are all taken from the Romish Church. We all admit, that her garments are spotted with the blood of saints, that her ambition has been as boundless and her measures to ensure the gratification of it, have been as unprincipled as those of Napoleon, or any ruthless adventurer, who considered mankind as his lawful prey. But what charges can you make against Protestants—those excellent men, who, at every hazard, vindicated civil liberty and religious freedom?' We would not charge the Protestants with the maintenance of the same unbounded claims to supremacy, nor even with as great excesses. But we do say, that Protestants have shed freely the blood of their fellow Christians, for differences of opinion in matters of faith. We say that the Calvinists of Geneva and of Holland and of Scotland, have claimed the right to burn and banish other Protestants, who differed from them far less than the Catholics differed from the Protestants. The age of burning is now past. But the English Church has continued its persecution of the Dissenters to this hour. No marriage can yet be solemnized by a dissenting clergyman, be he Calvinistic or Unitarian. It is not more than twenty years, since the blushes of a British parliament compelled them to strike out of the list of crimes, the denial of the equality of the Saviour and Son, with the Almighty God, his Father and Creator. Now indeed, a better day is dawning on the favored land of our fathers. Bigotry is yielding. The Anti-catholic Peele has at last, rather ungraciously, assented to a repeal of the detestable acts of exclusion of the Dissenters, and we are happy to perceive that Unitarians are included in the late reluctantly forced concession. Indeed it is a matter of sober, but singular observation, that Great Britain, whose Established Church is professedly and eminently Trinitarian, is far more liberal towards the Unitarians, than the Exclusive sect in our country—a country which professes to tolerate all sects. The late case, which occurred in Ireland, where a professed Unitarian was clerk of a Presbyterian Synod, and was, by the bigots of that Synod, attempted to be displaced on that ground, but supported by an overwhelming majority, may well excite a blush on the cheeks of our denouncing and Exclusive hierarchs. There is not, in truth, at this moment, even a tithe of the principles of religious toleration in the Exclusionists of the United States, which exists in the Established Church of Great Britain.

We now come to a more precise examination of the article before us, which is a lame defence of the Result of the Groton Council, which was reviewed in the *Christian Examiner* for March and April, 1827. There has been no small share of address, and what the world would call artifice, in the manner, in which this defence has been brought out. Our review of the Result of the Groton Council, professed to be an entire refutation of all the arguments in that elaborate and studied performance, which was in itself rather singular in its history and character. The Council adjourned for a long period, to enable a learned committee to prepare an able argument. The proceedings bear date in August, and yet that eminent work, as the Exclusive Christians affect to consider it, did not reach the public eye, till the succeeding winter, when it was pompously ushered into the world, and circulated with an overweening assumption of its superiority to all other arguments, and more especially to the miserable, drivelling reasoning of Chief Justice Parsons, Judge Sedgwick, and Chief Justice Parker and his learned associates, in a succession of cases, for fifteen years past, which had never before been impugned or assailed. In our review, the public will recollect, that we disproved many of the facts, on which the Groton Result was founded; we showed that its authors were entirely mistaken in their views of the history of the church in this State; we demonstrated, that the churches of this State had never been considered as corporate bodies, and, of course, could not come within the proviso of the third article of the Bill of Rights, which gives to religious societies, or corporate bodies, the exclusive right to elect their teachers. Now, we ask, what is the course which these learned divines have taken to defend their attack on the Judiciary of this State?

Soon after the publication of our review, we were threatened with an overwhelming reply from the pen of the Great Guardian and Metropolitan of all New England. We were told, that he was busied in searching records, and was resolved to bring the whole weight of his most powerful mind, not upon us humble reviewers, but upon that miserable, inefficient man, Chief Justice Parsons, and upon his successors and associates, Chief Justice Parker and others—such as Putnam, Jackson, and Wilde. We have waited with fearful suspense the execution of these threats. The dreadful blow, which, it appears, another hand is employed to inflict, was preceded by an annunciation, in a late Orthodox pamphlet, * that it was coming, and would prove decisive.

* Review of a Pamphlet on the Trust Deed of the Hanover Church, p. 25, note.

It has appeared. *Parturiunt montes*. After one year's delay, the Spirit of the Pilgrims appears, with what is in fact but a new edition of the Groton Result, without a single change of the argument, and without even an attempt to meet one of the objections to that extraordinary production. Before we proceed to the consideration of the specious fallacies by which the Result of the Groton Council is attempted to be supported, let us give a history of the facts.

Some twelve or fifteen years since, the Rev. Mr Burr, of Sandwich, having been a Liberal preacher, and having taught his own parish to believe the doctrines which we now hold to be sound, saw fit to change his creed. We honor him for the frankness which induced him to avow his change of opinions. We hold his right to do so a sacred one, and though our opinion may be of little value to him, heterodox as he now esteems us, it gives us pleasure to bear witness to our early and intimate knowledge of his worth. But unhappily for him, his parish did not change their opinions as he did. They adhered to the exposition of the scriptures, which he had exposed to them. An unhappy schism took place, and by a regularly constituted tribunal, after the usages of the Pilgrim Fathers, he was dismissed from his charge. But a majority of his church adhered to him. The question came before the Court, the highest Court of the State. They were compelled to give a construction to that clause of the Constitution, which vests the power in the people, and they did decide, that Mr Burr was legally and constitutionally removed. The humble defender of the Groton Result, in the pages before us, calls this oppression, and intimates, in terms easily understood, that the Judges, Parsons, Sedgwick, and Sewall, violated their solemn oaths of office—were guilty, in fact, of perjury, by making a decision in favor of their own religious opinions.

He does not apply it to the case of Mr Burr, it is true. The public services and the great exertions of Parsons, and his unrivalled fame, induced his party to delay this charge, till they could attack one, whom they thought more vulnerable. But whoever reads the Spirit of the Pilgrims, will readily perceive that the charge applies to all the decisions; for, if the others, who pronounced the early judgments, were pure and unbiassed, how can they have ground to say, that those who followed and sustained, as by law they were bound to sustain, the legal principles settled solemnly by their predecessors, were corrupt and wicked? That they do make such a charge against Chief Justice Parker, their language abundantly proves. They purposely select the Chief

Justice Parker, though they well knew, that he only pronounced the unanimous opinion of the whole Court, consisting of Thacher, Wilde, Jackson, and Putnam. The Chief Justice is charged with being influenced in his solemn opinion, under oath, by his personal religious notions—with a wicked and unjust decision, oppressive to the churches, and destructive of their rights. He is moreover charged with plagiarism, with adopting the opinions and even language of an article in the *Christian Disciple*, on the same topic, as if that gifted magistrate had not resources in his own mind, far greater than those from whom it is pretended he borrowed. This, we affirm, is the substance and intent of the writer's allusion to that article. Though this charge, we are assured, will prove harmless, yet we cannot pass it by, without remarking, that we know something of this venerable magistrate. We have known him from his youth. Under the blessing of Divine Providence, he has been the artificer of his own standing and character. He had no powerful friends to protect him in youth. He has risen to his present high and honorable eminence, by his own unaided talents and virtues. He is, more eminently than any man in the State, the favored child of the people—of all the people, the illiterate and the learned—the rich and the poor.

Chief Justice Parker has, however, one consolation, of which the spirit of religious arrogance cannot deprive him. He shares with Washington, the elder Adams, and Jay, the fate which too often awaits a conscientious discharge of public duty. He should remember, that the same set of men, who attempted to blast the unsullied reputation of his illustrious predecessor, Chief Justice Parsons, by a posthumous calumny, have directed their attack against himself. He could hardly expect to escape censure, when that ornament of his profession and of his country, was charged with prostituting his great powers, and violating his oath of office in a judicial decision. Such a charge *was* made against that eminent man by the authors of the Groton Result. In our review of that hardy production, we challenged the author, or authors of it, to produce any evidence of its truth. The charge was this;—that Chief Justice Parsons declared, that the construction, which he, personally, put upon the proviso of the third article of the Bill of Rights, was one, which he knew the people would have rejected. In other words, he gave a construction to a most important clause of the Constitution, diametrically opposed to its obvious meaning, and to the sense in which the people understood it. The charge involved, necessarily, judicial corruption, and a hardened, as well as foolish avowal of it.

The author of the present work neither disowns the calumny, nor attempts to support it by proof. What! are we to infer, that these reverend assailants of the character of one of the highest coordinate branches of the government, hope to screen themselves by employing the pen of another? Or do they believe, that their clerical character, and the sacredness of their cause, will justify their departure from the laws of society, and relieve them of the responsibility which is attached to other citizens? Or did they hope to escape from public censure, because they stated this calumnious charge as a matter of 'tradition?' Let them consult their legal advisers, and they will tell them, that to say that there is a 'tradition' that a man defrauded his friend, or murdered his wife, is as punishable as a positive assertion of it.

Our reverend critics of the decisions of our highest tribunals, were fully aware, in their new edition by another hand, that they would be charged with an indecent attack upon the Judiciary. Their consciences were alarmed, and they attempted to parry the attack, by what, we are reluctantly compelled to say, are mere hollow and hypocritical compliments to the court whom they traduced. These are strong expressions, extorted from us with great pain to ourselves. Yet we owe something to our laws, and Constitution—something to the eminent men, who are deputed to administer them.

Now, as this vindicator of the rights of the churches has resorted to juxtaposition, and enumeration, in order to present in a stronger light, what he is pleased to call the selfcontradictions of Chief Justice Parker, we beg leave to present to our readers, in a condensed form, the contradictions of the vindicator. We think that the most candid will admit, that, if such contradictions had appeared in the writings of one of the 'world,' or an 'unconverted sinner,'—a 'saint' would have had no hesitation in pronouncing the subsequent eulogy of Judge Parker to be mere cant, intended to soften the just indignation of the public.

'It is the more remarkable that Chief Justice Parker should hazard the assertions he has made on this subject, since the distinction between church and town is expressly recognized in the grants to the church in Dedham.'—'Yet the Judge would have us believe, that, in the early settlement of our country, "there was no great distinction between the church and the town," and that "a grant to the church, under such circumstances, could mean nothing else than a grant to the town."!!' p. 28.

Here is an implied charge of wilful falsehood on the part of Chief Justice Parker, which, by the double notes of admiration affixed, appears to have excited the surprise and horror of the vindicator.

'The learned Judge will pardon us, if we think these subjects *not a little* out of his professional sphere. To be sure, *as a man*, he has the same right *as any other man*,'—a wonderful concession for one of the Exclusive sect, who virtually deny to all other men, the right of private judgment,—*'to form his opinions, and to express them, on all religious subjects ; but, as the highest judicial officer in the Commonwealth, sitting on the bench of justice, and acting the part, not only of a Judge, but, in some sense, also of a legislator, we really think he may better leave disputed points in theology to be determined in their proper place.'* pp. 38, 39.

'In such utter *confusion and uncertainty* does the doctrine of the late decisions involve the ecclesiastical concerns of *this whole community*.' p. 41.

'The author of the decision in the Dedham case, is often *inconsistent with himself*.' p. 43.

The latter expressions are Italicized by the vindicator. Again ;—

'If any person skilled in law, *or in anything else*, will analyze the following sentence, reconcile its different members, and make sense of the whole, we *will* be, 'meaning *shall* be,' very much obliged to him.' p. 44.

Yet of this weak, inconsistent, meddling magistrate, the vindicator, having the fear of public wrath before his eyes, thus speaks ;—

'We have only to say further, that nothing here written is to be interpreted as *impeaching the professional ability of the Supreme Judges* of this Commonwealth. We believe them all, *and the Chief Justice especially*, to be men of talents, of learning, and of general good qualifications for the stations they occupy.' p. 47.

Now we ask, if the Judges do possess all these requisite qualities, and, these notwithstanding, have made so oppressive, absurd, inconsistent, and unconstitutional a decision, as this learned writer attempts to show they have done, what can we infer, but that they are corrupt, and therefore that his compliments are hypocritical, though our respect for his profession would make us hesitate to admit it? The clerical office is venerable, and entitled to our highest respect, when its functionaries behave in a manner worthy of their station. But the most venerable offices are liable to abuse. Men, sometimes, to the distress of all true Christians, are inducted into that holy office, who have every requisite quality, but the most valuable and important one, the spirit of our holy religion—the spirit of peace. There have been men of that profession, who, in all times, have been men of strife—men who have loved discord and dissension. When divines, mistaking their duty, which eminently obliges them to uphold the civil magistrate in his lawful functions, step forth, and with great zeal, hold up the magistrates as weak reasoners, as influenced by sectarian views in their solemn decisions, as plagiarists, borrowing their thoughts from occasional essays without examining

for themselves—more especially, when they stamp with their ill-informed censures, the decisions of the Courts, as oppressive and cruel to large masses of citizens, whom they arrogantly call the saints—the elect of the earth, and whom they intimate to be as far superior to ordinary men, as heaven is above earth—we may well pause, and we do pause, to ask, whether there exists in this country, or in any country not Papal, such a power to denounce whole masses of professing Christians. Heaven forbid that we should deny the right of any citizen to call in question the decisions of the highest Court of Law. There is no power so high, in our country, that its acts may not be the subjects of free discussion. But there is a manner and a moderation in everything. The decisions of the Supreme Court are the law of the land. In common cases, the Legislature may change the law, if the Judges decide against the public will. In the present case, the decision was founded on a construction of the Constitution, and no power, but the people, by an amendment of the Constitution, can change it.

The singularity of the present case consists in this, and it is indeed unique, and without example. Some Connecticut casuists, accustomed to a state of things, in which, we had almost said, the clergy hold all the power, and the people are accounted as nothing, have been in a time of excitement imported into this State. Bringing with them their own ideas of the supremacy of the clergy, they quarrel with the liberal and ingenuous feelings of our people, and wish to persuade them, that the chains and fetters of Connecticut are indeed very comfortable things, and well suited to the wrists and ancles of the stubborn freemen of Massachusetts. They tell us, in plain terms, that the liberty which we have acquired, with great toil and suffering during a contest of two centuries, is no liberty at all, and that if we would only quietly consent to the easy handcuffs, which they, from long experience, have learnt to forge, we shall be more at our ease than we were before. These imported directors of Massachusetts consciences, assure us, that we are anxious for this change from freedom to slavery—that tens of thousands of our people really groan under the liberty, which our excellent Judges, by a correct and manly exposition of the Constitution, have opened to us. We challenged them in our review of the Groton Result, to explain why, if such are the sentiments of our people, and if, at heart, they do really prefer slavery to freedom, why, when this specific article was discussed at the noblest and fullest collection of the intellect and wisdom of Massachusetts, the late Convention for revising the Constitution, the Orthodox did

not dare to move the question, although Judge Parsons's decisions were then of old date, and Judges Parker, Wilde, Jackson, and Putnam's judicial sentences were recent and festering sores in the bosoms of the Exclusive and intolerant sect? We have had no answer to this question, except the repetition of the same idle boast, the more loud because there is a consciousness of its idleness, that the people are alarmed, and uneasy. Now, we challenge them, after both parties have been fully heard, to move this year, at the winter session, an amendment of the Constitution, restoring the churches to their usurped power, and we promise our support in the attempt, confident that the people would reject it with disdain.

Before we proceed to examine the argument, if it deserves the name, of the writer in question, we shall notice a particular attack on Chief Justice Parker, which, as it was very amusing to us for its modesty, so we doubt not it will be equally so to our readers for its novelty, and accuracy of thought.

'We object,' says this learned divine and still more learned lawyer, 'to the views expressed in the decision of the Dedham case, that they are too evidently of a *sectarian* character.'—'We do complain that the highest judicial officer in the State, while seated on the bench of justice, should allow himself to go into a discussion of *theological questions*, and make them a ground of his decision, in a way to favor one religious denomination, and to *prejudice others*. The Constitution wisely provides, that "no *subordination* of any *one* sect or denomination of Christians to another, shall ever be established by law." We would inquire, then, whether it can be *constitutional* for an officer of the government, whose decisions are to have the *force of law*, to attempt *determining points of theology* which are at issue between different denominations of Christians.' p. 38.

This then is the charge, that Chief Justice Parker, unconstitutionally, by a solemn decision, 'established by law' a subordination of other sects to some *one* sect, and this the writer declares to be the Unitarian sect.

What, in the language of Courts Martial—for this is a belligerent attack on the Chief Justice—what is the *specification* to support this charge? It is in these words, that he '*took upon him* to say, that the "practice of the Episcopal Churches," in regard to the Sacrament, "is more conformable to the practice of the primitive Christian churches, than that of most of those who dissent from their mode of worship." That is to say, that Chief Justice Parker, himself not an Episcopalian, by his decision, made the other churches *subordinate* to the Episcopalian; for, if he did not effect this, it could not be unconstitutional. Does this anonymous vindicator of the churches believe, that the Court decided, as a point of law, that the Episcopalian mode of ad-

mission to the sacrament was the primitive one? If so, it is the *law of the land!* and must be obeyed till changed by legislative enactment. We know well, that this is too ludicrous for refutation, and yet it was not too ludicrous for our divine seriously to urge. What sort of readers did the vindicator of the rights of the churches mean to address? Must he carry into his legal arguments, the same strain of dogmatism, to which his theological connexions have accustomed him, and does he expect, from an enlightened public, a blind submission to his legal *dicta*?

This is not all. He adds, in a tone of selfcomplacent triumph—‘The learned Judge will *pardon us*, if we think these subjects *not a little* out of his professional sphere.’ ‘*We really think* he may better leave *disputed points in theology* to be determined in their *proper* place.’ Is any place improper for Christians to examine disputed points on the most important of all subjects? But how modest and delicate this reproof of a Court of Law, on the part of a divine who is discussing and reviewing the decisions of eminent jurists!—of a divine, who quotes Coke upon Littleton, and prates about prescriptions and *cestui que trusts*, with the confidence of a barrister of fifty years’ standing! It was, however, no point of theology, upon which Chief Justice Parker, in a course of reasoning, expressed a private sentiment. It was simply a question of history, to which he was as competent as his reverend reviler. Lawyers may study what they are bound to study by the most momentous of all motives, and though this writer, a stranger in this vicinity, may be ignorant of it, we can assure him, that the predecessor of Judge Parker, Chief Justice Parsons, was one of the most learned theologians in our country, and if he ever heard of Lord Chancellor Sir Peter King, we can assure him, that he wrote a treatise clearly establishing the *right of all professing* Christians to partake of the sacrament, which if he has an inclination to answer and the ability to refute, we have certainly underrated his presumption as well as his powers. But before he undertakes the task, we advise him to read a little more, and to reason not a little better. He ought to know, that the authority of the early fathers, who were nearly cotemporary with the apostles, is not so clearly in his favor, and that the learned Chancellor did not differ so much from Chief Justice Parker, as he did from this critic on this point. But it is alleged, that the Chief Justice went out of his ‘professional sphere’ in giving out this suggestion. How does the writer know that? Was he present at the trial? Does he not know, that this very point was a part of the argument,

of which it was proper to take notice? Yet it was no *decision*—and nothing but gross ignorance of the course of judicial proceedings, can apologize for attacking it as such.

We have made this introduction longer than we proposed, and yet less could not have been said, in justice to the memory of the dead, or the character and merits of the living. The habit of abuse has been so confirmed by long indulgence, on the part of the Exclusive sect—they have so freely and so incessantly arraigned the clergy and the flocks of the Liberal party, that they cannot check the disposition to it. The highest tribunals have become the objects of their scorn and contempt. The very fountains of justice are attempted to be disturbed, and instead of honoring, as the apostle of their Lord and Master commanded them, those in rule and authority, they invoke upon them the maledictions of the whole community. To that sovereign tribunal we appeal with alacrity and undoubting confidence.

There are three distinct classes of readers in our community. The first estimate the value of an argument principally according to its length. The greater the number of pages, the more convincing, in their view, is the work. They are in a state of wonder and admiration, when they perceive a long array of quotations from books which they have never heard of. They never dream of inquiring whether the passages quoted have any bearing on the question. Especially are they moved if the quotations are made from the holy scriptures. Their deserved veneration for the sacred volume induces them to believe, that, if the writer cites chapter and verse, his argument must be sound. Though the text may prove the directly opposite proposition from that for the support of which it is cited, they never trouble their heads about such a trifling objection. The author quotes scripture, and it must be true. This class of readers think that ten weak arguments are more than equivalent to one unanswerable one. There are certain writers who perfectly comprehend this weakness of human nature, and they studiously avail themselves of it. They know that the impression once made on such slow and feeble understandings, can never be effaced. The very defect, which disabled them, in the first instance, from detecting the fallacy in reasoning, or the inapplicability of an authority cited, makes them obstinate in resisting an attack on their once settled opinions.

There is a second class, who read with the view and the capacity to understand a question; to whom mental exertion is a pleasure; who feel it a duty to exercise the noblest gift of God to

man in the investigation of truth. Such men value a work on any subject, precisely in proportion to its claims on their respect as rational beings. A multitude of words, and declamatory appeals to their passions, put them on their guard. They distrust those who make a great parade of their learning, when the occasion does not require it. If they detect a disposition to sophism, and fallacious reasoning, they examine the work with a natural and just suspicion. This class of readers have a most thorough contempt for inapposite, random quotations, and they prefer one sound solid reason, which approves itself to their enlightened understandings, to a volume of questionable and feeble arguments.

The third class of readers are your enlisted party men, who bravely resolve to praise whatever their party leaders may please to say, be it right or wrong, and who resolutely refuse to read anything which may be offered against it. Such persons, and they constitute no inconsiderable proportion of some sects, are beyond and above, or below, reason. They have a thorough dread of it—a very natural dread of it, because it is a faculty of which they have but little conception, and we always have a superstitious fear of the unknown. It need not be said, that we do not address this well disciplined Macedonian Phalanx. We know very well that they will abuse us, without knowing why.

To the second class of readers, who peruse with willing and intelligent minds, we shall present a brief and condensed view of the question at issue, for there is but one question in the case; and we advise them to stop and read no more, for the rest of our remarks are not intended for them. They are designed to show the first class, the ignorant and undisciplined minds, that all which appears to be gold, is not such.

The only question at issue between the nine Justices of the Supreme Judicial Court, dead or living, who are attacked, on the one side, and the vindicator of the churches, on the other, is merely a question of property, and that comparatively of little value. Nine tenths of the churches in this State have no property whatever, except the communion plate, and that frequently has been purchased by the parish, or given by opulent men, often non-communicants. The Courts of Law have, in all their decisions, expressly admitted, what this writer and his coadjutors have so much labored to prove, that the church is a body, not a corporate one, known to our laws; that it is entitled to high respect as a religious body; that the usages of our ancestors, in giving a preference to that body in church affairs, especially in the election of officers, pastor and deacons, are to be held in veneration, and to be preserved—subject, however, to be so overruled

by the rights of all freemen, and the principles of all free institutions, that if the majority cannot agree with the church in opinion, the great principle of the sovereignty of the people must prevail. They recommend that the church should exercise its ancient usage of election in the first instance, but if their choice should fall upon a person not agreeable to the parish at large, as to his sentiments, talents, doctrines, manners, or character, the final power must rest, where the Constitution has placed it, in the people.

The whole amount of the decisions of Parsons, Sewall, Sedgwick, Dawes, Thacher, Parker, Jackson, Putnam, and Wilde, has been, that if the members of the church, after attempting to compromise, come to a direct quarrel with the people, who are taxed for the support of the pastor, the Constitution gives the power, in the last resort, to the whole public. The church may withdraw, they may form a new society, and elect their own pastor; but he will not be the pastor of that parish, but of a new and a legal parish; they cannot carry with them the parochial property. Now let us pause to examine this question, not by the force and authority of the decisions of the Court, great as the authority of such opinions are, but by the light of reason.

Church property consists of donations to the church, but in all cases, without one exception, to the *church of a particular parish*. The Brattle Street, and the First Church in Boston, hold real estates given to the use of the ministry in these churches. Suppose a discord between the church and people in those societies, and that the people, under the constitutional provision, choose a minister, which it is now reluctantly admitted they have a right to do, and that the church, dissatisfied, remove *en masse*, by a unanimous vote, which we all admit *they* have a right to do, and choose their own pastor—Will the pastor of the church be the minister of the church in Brattle Street? Could he, when settled in Berry Street or in Hollis Street, for example, maintain a suit against the resident minister of the Brattle Street Church, for his house in Court Street? To lawyers, the proposition would seem at once to be absurd. Nor is the difficulty merely technical, it is a very substantial one. The Church in Brattle Street was gathered according to the usages of our ancestors; and surely, when the church, that is to say, the frail and fallible individuals, who are mere men, choose to withdraw, from pique or principle, that society of worshipping Christians have as good a right to form a church, as the first four or ten or twenty members originally had, and they would be the lawful church of that parish. Will the Orthodox

or Exclusive sect deny this? If they would, why, in the parish of Mr Morey and Mr Storer, did they institute a new church, comprising the minority of the old church, without obtaining dismission from the old church, and pending a petition for such a dismission, contrary to the Cambridge Platform? The truth is, that the Platform, and the usages of our ancestors, are, in their hands, like clay in the hands of the potter. They mould and fashion them according to their present interests, holding probably, that heretical churches, as they account heresy, have no rights.

There are great, and unanswerable reasons for the decision of the Court in the Dedham case. Property granted to churches was granted unquestionably from local attachment; from attachment to the society and place in which the donor worshipped. Can a Court overlook this important consideration? Let us apply it to cases much stronger in our favor. The Andover Fund was granted by the Phillips family, solely, or principally, to do honor, and to advance the prosperity of their native town. The trustees, however, reside in various parts of the State. The property is absolutely vested in them. Could they remove the institution from Andover? The Roxbury Grammar School was founded for teaching the poor of Roxbury. Could the trustees, by removal to Dorchester, transfer the funds to that town? But these are supposed cases. Let us take an actual one. There was a project, started by the Orthodox party, for removing Williams College to Northampton. Remove it they undoubtedly with legislative aid could have done. But could they legally have carried with it Mr Williams's donation? No man could pretend to maintain a proposition so unjust. Grant, then, for argument's sake, that churches are corporate bodies; could they, in dissevering voluntarily their connexion with another corporate body, with which they had been indissolubly united by our laws and usages, carry with them funds granted to them by a characteristic local name, which of itself confined them to a particular spot? Our author, aware of this, seems to admit, that though a church may remove a mile, yet they could not carry the church funds to Ohio—a concession, which, of itself, yields the whole argument. Could the President and Fellows of Harvard College in Cambridge, carry the funds granted by Harvard, to the School at Newton, or the funds of Holworthy, Hollis, Eliot, Parkman, Gore, Perkins, and many others, into Canada, or to Amherst? Yet the argument is as strong in favor of such a removal, as that in favor of a church, which should choose to separate itself from any society, be it a parish by limits, or a pew parish.—Let it be recollected, that in this brief, and, as we think,

conclusive view of the whole dispute, we admit, *pro formâ*, for the sake of argument only, all the absurd, and easily refuted arguments of the 'Spirit of the Pilgrims;' a spirit, which the Pilgrims, honest and conscientious as they were, would indignantly have disclaimed. They were not the men, to claim the property which belonged to others by every title, sacred and profane.

But to proceed with our examination of the pamphlet under review;—the first point, assumed by the vindicator of the rights of the churches, is one of very little moment, and which may soon be dismissed; namely, that there were in the days of the apostles churches distinct from congregations.

We may admit this to be true, without in any degree conceding the inference drawn from it. When the whole world was heathen, with the exception of the apostles and a few converts, it may be admitted, that many attended their preaching who were not converted to Christianity. But what bearing has this fact upon the present state of a christian people, where all are professing Christians, and all members of christian societies?

It is not, however, admitted by Sir Peter King, who has examined this question profoundly, that there was, in the early ages of Christianity, any distinction between the children of believers, who had been baptized, and other Christians, as to the right of admission to the sacrament. The Romish Church, and the English Episcopal Church know of no such distinction at the present day. The English Church, to be sure, have adopted the practice of confirmation by the bishop, but comparatively few are ever confirmed, and yet all are admitted to the communion. By what right are any excluded in our churches? Where is the text of scripture, which gives to the priest the right to say, 'You shall not commemorate the death and sufferings of your Lord and Saviour, though by the rite of solemn baptism, you have been admitted into the christian fold?' No such text can be produced, no such early principle and practice of exclusion can be found. A baptized Christian, of good moral character, in the greater part of the christian world, has, as he had in the early ages, an acknowledged right to exercise all the powers, and to perform all the duties of a Christian.

The next point of the vindicator of the rights of churches, is, that in Massachusetts, the churches, from the settlement of the country, were an exclusive body, chose their own pastors and other officers, &c. This is not denied, and the writer admits that it is not denied. This is the very essence of our complaint against the early settlers, that they were usurpers over God's

heritage; that they shut the door of the sanctuary to all but themselves or their friends, to all who would not adopt their creed. They did more, and we pause to ask whether our ambitious divines of the Orthodox church do not aim at the same usurpation—they interfered with the civil and political rights of the people. They availed themselves of their power over the minds of a very pious and excellent race of men, to extort laws which fettered the civil ruler and the people. They procured a law, that no man should be a freeman, unless he was a church member. The clergy often dictated to the Legislature the laws which they should enact. They forced down the Cambridge Platform, though it was resisted with great pertinacity, and their usurpation lasted, though not without frequent disturbance, till 1692. All this is admitted on both sides. But when has it been heard before, since our revolution in 1775, that the fact that abuses and usurpations existed in the reigns of the three Stuarts—for it was not till the expulsion of Sir Edmund Andros, that any Englishman in this province was truly free—when was it ever pretended that old usurpations were authorities to govern the present state of society? At that time we had a royal governor, and our laws were subject to royal revision. It is, however, confessed by our opponent, that, in 1692, the people gained a victory over the priests and the church, that is, over the hierarchy. We do not use these terms unadvisedly, or by way of opprobrium. We say soberly, that no power was ever more despotic, than that of the New England churches, in principle, down even to 1720.

But in 1692 the people were restored to their natural rights. All Christians had a voice on the most important of all subjects, which regards the success of their religion. All men had an equal interest in the piety, the talents, and the capacity of their religious teachers to unfold the counsels of God. All men, of course, had an equal right to a voice in selecting their religious teachers. And, in truth, there is no middle course, no halting between two opinions. Either the church is confined to a privileged caste, a favored few, or it is the property of all believing Christians, and, in this age, there exists no miraculous power in the clergy, or self-styled church, to distinguish between professing and believing Christians. Open immorality is good cause of exclusion from the sacrament. Opinions are sacred, and no man has the power to judge his brother as to them. These are not *our dicta*, but they are those of our Saviour and of his apostles.

The victory of Christians was completed in 1692. This is admitted by the vindicator of the rights of the churches. But to what a subterfuge is he driven, to elude this decision of an awakened

and long oppressed people? Why, truly, to one which escaped even the penetration and subtilty of the framers of the Groton Result. It is this, that the law of 1692, restoring to the *people* their inalienable right of choosing their *teachers*, did not affect the right of the *church* to choose its own *pastor*. Here, is broached and brought forward in full relief, a metaphysical distinction between the offices of *minister* and *pastor*. The minister belongs to the society, the pastor to the church. The writer admits, throughout his whole work, that the society may choose its minister, but that he is no pastor. Well, then, what is he? He has a right to administer the communion, to baptize, to marry—I speak of *our laws*—and what is the pastor more? He has no greater authority. Is there a glebe or parish house? The minister is entitled to it. Is there an exemption from taxation by law? The minister can claim it. It is, in truth, one of the most pitiable evasions, which could occur to a writer, driven to extremity; and no man would dare to bring it forth, who did not count upon the entire command he possessed over minds habituated to obey and to believe, without the exercise of reason.

But pray, if it were true, as this writer pretends to have discovered—and the discovery is all his own—that the statute of 1692 left the church in the undisturbed possession of its right to choose its own pastor—why did the churches exert all their influence at the polls in 1693, and procure an act vesting the church with a *concurrent* power with the people? Why were they contented with a divided power for eightyfive years, when, as this writer pretends, the church was left in possession of the whole power of electing its pastor? Does the history of the priesthood authorise the belief, that they have ever been willing to divide the power with the laity, when they could avoid it? Why not proceed to exercise the absolute power reserved to them to choose their own pastor, and leave the laymen in possession of all the power they ever coveted, to choose their own minister? It had been well if they had done it. The separation in 1692 would have been a most auspicious separation, and the dawn of religious freedom would have been one hundred years sooner than it actually was. No—finding the power departing from them, they consented, reluctantly, to share it with the people, and they have now the effrontery to praise this division of power, as one of the most happy devices which human ingenuity could have framed, to reconcile the interests of all classes of Christians. Such is the language of the Groton Result; but how hollow all such professions are, we may learn by facts, which

speaking a stronger language than any professions. We allude to the *trust deeds* of various Calvinistic churches, by which the arbitrary, despotic principles of 1641 are revived in all their intolerance. In these *trusts*, we hear no more of their professions of respect for the *right of the society* to choose *their teacher*, but the whole power is reserved to the church, and that too, on a principle far more reprehensible than that of our ancestors; for *they* did not confine the *church itself*, to all ages, to a particular creed, but our usurpers bind the church, by legal, artificial devices, always to construe the scriptures as they do. Search them they may, but if the research shall change their faith, they must quit their property, or surrender their consciences.

[To be continued.]

ART. IX.—1. *The Future Punishment of Infants not a Doctrine of Calvinism*; 2. *The Future Punishment of Infants never a Doctrine of the Calvinistic Churches*; 3. *On the Future State of Infants*;—three Letters addressed ‘*To the Editor of the Christian Examiner*,’ and published in ‘*The Spirit of the Pilgrims*’ for January, February, and March. By the Rev. LYMAN BEECHER, D. D. Boston. Pierce & Williams. 1828. 8vo. pp. 43.

[Continued from page 263.]

AFTER Calvin, the next authority we originally quoted to show that the doctrine of infant damnation is a part of Calvinism and has been held to be such by approved Calvinistic writers, was Turretin, who, as we have already remarked, is reputed to have given a more complete system of Calvinistic theology than even his master. But, says Dr Beecher, ‘Turretin, as quoted by the reviewer,’ teaches only that infants deserve damnation, not that they are actually damned, and ‘we might as well have quoted “Adam, Seth, Enoch.”’ This, as usual, he attempts to show by a syllogism in which he takes for granted the whole matter in dispute; viz. that all we have produced from Turretin really amounts to no more than Dr Beecher finds it convenient to report to his readers. What he reports, however, is but a part of what we adduced or referred to, and, as in the case of similar passages from Calvin, was cited by us merely to show how naturally the doctrine in question results from essential vital principles of Calvinism. Even those of our quotations

which he regards as not to our purpose, Dr Beecher does not lay before his readers, that they may have an opportunity to decide upon them for themselves, although he might have known that his bare assertion that they are inapplicable, would not make them so.

What then are the facts? Did we, as Dr Beecher asserts that we did, produce Turretin as a believer in infant damnation, on no better ground than his teaching 'that infants, as corrupted by original sin, do deserve damnation?' Certainly not. The very remark we begun with, was, that, 'on the doctrine of original sin and the ruin that it brings upon infants, he [Turretin] quotes with approbation some of the most offensive passages in Calvin's writings;' and had Dr Beecher looked at one of the paragraphs to which we referred him,* he might have found among those offensive passages, the following;—'*Iterum quæro unde factum est, ut tot gentes unâ cum liberis eorum infantibus æternæ morti involveret lapsus Adæ absque remedio, &c.*,'—a passage, which our learned author has some reason to remember, and which, as we have demonstrated, teaches undeniably the 'monstrous doctrine' that infants are damned.†

Besides, we made an extract from Turretin, in which he gives the very interpretation to Romans, v. 14, which, in the case of Dr Gill, Dr Beecher himself has been compelled to admit, makes that text teach actual infant damnation. 'Death reigned,' says St Paul, 'from Adam to Moses, even over such as had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression.' By 'such as had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression,' Turretin tells us, repeatedly,‡ that the apostle meant INFANTS, and, by the death that reigned over them, he thinks St Paul meant not only natural, but spiritual and ETERNAL DEATH. Such is the teaching of 'Turretin, as quoted by the reviewer,' and yet Dr Beecher tells us we have shown only that he taught infants deserve damnation, not that their merited torments are actually inflicted, though it appears that we referred him to one

* Turretin. Institut. Theologiæ. P. I. p. 686. Ed. 1696.

† We have already said so much and given so many translations of this passage, that even the unlearned reader who has followed us thus far, may dispense with a rendering of it here, or we would add to the versions by Professor Norton, Jeremy Taylor, Thomas Norton, Nichols, John Calvin, and ourselves, that adopted by Bishop Hobart of New York, and the Rev. Daniel Burhans of Connecticut, who both regard it as teaching 'that the fall of Adam did wrap up in eternal death so many nations, with their children, being infants, without remedy.' See a sermon, entitled, 'The Scripture Doctrine of the Election of Jacob and Rejection of Esau, considered. By Rev. Daniel Burhans, A. M. Rector of Trinity Church, Newtown, (Conn.)' Sec. Ed. p. 17, where Dr Hobart is referred to, thus; 'Apol. p. 264. Note.'

‡ Institut. Theol. P. I. pp. 508—9, quoted in our review; also pp. 523, 683, 698.

passage in which he approves of Calvin's doctrine that infants are *remedilessly* involved in the fall, and actually quoted another, in which he represents them as under the dominion of eternal death! Was it honest, while pretending to give an account of our citations from this author, to omit all mention of these decisive passages, or must we regard it as another illustration of what Dr Beecher assures us of himself, and seems determined we shall not want reasons for believing, viz. that 'in matters of importance he is not disposed to stand about trifles?' That we did not mistake the interpretation which Turretin gives to the words of St Paul, will appear from the following sentence, taken from his attempt to prove the imputation of Adam's sin from Romans, v. 12, 13, 14, &c.

'The death which *reigned* through sin,' he says, 'embraces within its compass SPIRITUAL DEATH, according to the threatening of God.'*

Again, Turretin contends that original sin, is '*propagated* from Adam to all his posterity, who are to proceed from him by natural generation,' and, in the course of his seventh argument, again speaks of the reign of death as follows;—

"By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin," Rom. v. 12, where,' he says, 'the apostle ascends to the first infection of evil, and discovers the origin of sin and death, to wit, the first sin of man, which entered into the world, that is, among mankind, both by imputation and by propagation, which the apostle proves from the circumstance that DEATH, the necessary effect of sin, *reigns* over all, *external* and temporal, as well as *internal* and spiritual, and also ETERNAL [DEATH].' †

In these passages, the *death* mentioned in Rom. v. 12–14, is explained to be, not only natural, but also SPIRITUAL and ETERNAL DEATH, and in the following extract Turretin asserts that the empire of this death extends over infants, as he had before said in the passage we cited in our review.

'So far,' he contends, 'is the apostle from wishing to deny that that sin was imputed, that he rather means to prove the contrary, which he infers from vs. 14., from the *empire of death*, which "reigned even over those who had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression;" that is to say, over INFANTS, who cannot be said to have sinned actually as Adam did.' ‡

Turretin, then, one of the very highest of all Calvinistic authorities, was a believer in actual infant damnation, and that too, 'as quoted by the reviewer.' We will add one passage more, however, though we think it superfluous. He is speaking to the question whether there be any such thing as original sin, and gives the opinions of various 'heretics' who held to the negative. He mentions, and of course condemns, the doctrines of—

* Institut. Theol. P. I. p. 681.

† Ibid. p. 698.

‡ Ibid. p. 683.

1st.—The ancient Pelagians, who, having followed as their master, Pelagius the Briton, denied original sin in all its parts, contending that the sin of Adam hurt nobody but himself, or, if it should be said to have injured anybody else, that it was through example or imitation, not by propagation.—2d. The Socinians, who, although they acknowledge in all a power to sin, because God gave them a will free to choose either good or evil, yet expressly deny that there is any original sin.—3d. Not unlike them are the Remonstrants, who, in their Apology, pronounce it certain, *whatever Augustin and others may have determined to the contrary*, that God will appoint, and that he, on account of original sin so called, with justice can appoint to ETERNAL TORMENTS, NO INFANTS, of whatever lot or descent, dying without actual and personal sins, [holding] that this opinion, viz. that any infants will be appointed to eternal torments, 'is opposed to the divine goodness and right reason, nay, that it is uncertain whether the preponderance is in favor of its absurdity or its cruelty. Curcellæus openly denies the same, in Dissert. 2, On Original Sin.—4th. Among the Roman Catholics, Pighius and Catharinus restrict original sin to imputation alone, denying its propagation. The Anabaptists, following the steps of the former, call original sin *Augustin's figment*. But to all these, THE ORTHODOX CHURCH has ALWAYS opposed herself, and CONSTANTLY held the affirmative.*

Here, let it be observed, Turretin speaks not only for himself, but also for the 'Orthodox Church,' or, as Dr Beecher has it, 'the churches denominated Calvinistic,' which Turretin tells us have 'ALWAYS,' and Dr Beecher tells us have 'NEVER' held the doctrine of infant damnation. Turretin was unquestionably a man of profound learning; but whether he or Dr Beecher is upon that score the more likely to be correct on the point so completely at issue between them, is a question, upon which we, certainly, shall not venture to express an opinion. We must be content, for the present, with remarking, that a doctrine acknowledged and taught as a part of their system, by Calvin and Turretin, must be a Calvinistic doctrine, and, so far as that point is concerned, we might consider the controversy as at an end here. But the damnation of infants was not a belief peculiar to Calvin or Calvinists. It had been adopted by the Roman Catholic Church for ages, and the Reformers are not exclusively entitled to the praise of giving this last finish to their doctrines of predestination and original sin. They had become familiar with its horrors in the common belief of that church, that such as die without baptism, including of course all heathen infants, have nothing to save them from hell, or at least from future punishment somewhere. Though most Protestants at last dissented from the church they abandoned, in denying the necessity of this rite to salvation, the damnation of infants was, nevertheless, held to be a necessary consequence of their guiltiness by nature

* Instit. Theol. P. I. pp. 694, 695.

and reprobation by God. The Catholics, in the superabundance of their compassion, had provided a *limbus infantum*, a place reserved especially for these little ones, in which they were to suffer something less than the full torments of hell—a notion, which was ridiculed by the Protestants, who, in more perfect consistency, as will soon be seen, with Augustin, the common authority of both parties, held that there are but two places for all who are to appear before the judgment seat of Christ, a heaven and a hell—the one on the right hand, the other on the left of the Judge, and that such as are not admitted to the former, must necessarily take up their abode in the latter. This, we are persuaded, has been the belief of Calvinists of all former ages, and, unless upon this point too they have deserted the Westminster Assembly, it is also the faith of Calvinists of the present day.

The thought of there being infants in hell, did not, therefore, originate with the Reformation, or with Calvin and his followers. For centuries it had been deemed, what Turretin asserts it to be, a heresy to deny the truth of the doctrine. Augustin, especially, after the commencement of his controversy with the Pelagians, was so distinguished for the earnestness and perseverance with which he maintained it, that *durus pater infantum*, the hard father of infants, became an appellation of him as notorious as the fact that he is also the father of Calvinism. It was because of this last circumstance alone, however, that we introduced his name into this controversy. But Dr Beecher seems not to be aware—he certainly does not give its just weight to the fact—that Calvin's doctrines of original sin and irrespective decrees, from which infant damnation is the inevitable and acknowledged result, differ in no essential respect from Augustin's, so that, as observed in our review, a quotation from Augustin on either of these doctrines, and upon many others, is as good an evidence of what Calvinism is, as a quotation from Calvin himself. Calvin, we say, took his doctrines of predestination and original sin from Augustin, and if Augustin believed, and stated it to be a consequence of those doctrines, that certain infants will inevitably be damned, it is a fact, which, to say the least of it, must go far to prevent our surprise at finding a similar or even a worse position maintained by his follower. Now it is certainly more honorable, or rather it is less discreditable to Dr Beecher, to suppose him utterly ignorant of this well known relationship between the systems of Calvin and Augustin, than to imagine he knew of it, and yet could ridicule an argument founded upon it, of which that knowledge would render it impossible for him to question the soundness. We shall, therefore,

allow that our learned author was not aware of what is so familiar to the most superficially instructed in the history of theological opinions, and proceed to expose the grounds on which he has presumed to speak of the sentiments of a writer, whom the Letters before us afford us no evidence that he has ever even looked into. After his remarks upon our quotations from Calvin and Turretin, which, in our estimation, left him *absque remedio*, without a word to say, Dr Beecher, not in the manner of the grave and learned divine that he is, but in a mode of writing in which it is difficult to say which character predominates, that of the warrior, the lawyer, or the sophist, goes on as follows;—

‘And now, elated by such a victory, in true Bonapartean style, he follows us up in our discomfiture, to make an end of us, by pouring in upon us the testimony of AUGUSTINE, a man who lived some ten centuries before Calvin was born, in order to prove that the Calvinists of New England and the United States, between whom and Augustine fifteen centuries have intervened, do believe, nevertheless, that infants are damned. This is the greatest march of mind that I have met with in these marching days; the most fearless act of mental agility, I cannot but think, ever attempted,—to make the premises and conclusion leap a ditch of fifteen centuries to come together. Now let us see how they succeed. At two leaps it is done. “Calvin thought highly of Augustine, and constantly (often) cited him as the highest authority; therefore, on the subject of infant damnation, Calvin must have believed as Augustine did. But Calvinists of the present day think highly of Calvin, and often quote him as the highest authority; therefore, they believe, on the subject of infant damnation, as Calvin believed.”

‘Now then for the syllogism: He that highly esteems and almost constantly quotes an author as of the very highest authority, must be supposed to believe exactly as he does on all points, &c.’ pp. 87, 88.

So much for the sophist and the warrior—‘so they play their parts.’ Next the lawyer comes upon the stage, and addresses us in the words we have before quoted;—

‘Now if we were in a court of justice, we should be permitted to cross-question these witnesses. And, as a “deep stain” is likely to be fixed on our character, should we be convicted, I know not why legal evidence should not be demanded. I would take the liberty, therefore, to ask John Calvin a few questions.

Dr Beecher. ‘Has your high estimation of Augustine led you anywhere to avow, that you believed in every sentiment which he taught?’

John Calvin. ‘Never.’ p. 88.

We, in our turn, would ask Dr Beecher, where the reviewer has ever intimated his belief of so silly a proposition, as that because one writer thinks highly of another, their sentiments must therefore be the same on *all* points? Our argument, he well knew, related only to the doctrines of predestination and original sin, and we contended that a certain inference from those doctrines, had been expressly admitted by both of the

writers in question. But be this as it may, Dr Beecher proceeds with his cross-examination, and, after obtaining the answer from Calvin, which we have shown to be directly contradicted by his writings, says ;—

‘We would now put a few questions also to Augustine.

Dr Beecher. ‘Did you, Sir, believe and teach that infants are damned ; meaning by the term damnation, what it is now in common use understood to mean—a condition of excessive and unmingled suffering, bodily and mental ?

‘*AUG.* Horresco ! Nunquam, nunquam. Dixi “Contra Julianum, lib. i. cap. 16. Potest proinde recte dici parvulos sine baptismo de corpore exeuntes in damnatione omnium mitissime futuros ;” et lib. v. cap. 8, dixi “Ego non dico parvulos sine baptismo Christi morientes, tanta pœna esse plectendos ut eis non nasci potius expediret.” Miror ! Indignor ! O tempora ! O mores !*’

‘You see, Sir, how Augustine feels at your misrepresentation of him—as if he taught that infants were sent to the gloom and torments of a “Calvinistic hell ;” when what he taught in fact was, the damnation of infants as consisting chiefly, if not entirely, in the loss of that holy enjoyment in heaven for which their depravity disqualified them ; and if they suffered a positive evil at all, it was of the very mildest kind ; and such as rendered their eternal existence, on the whole, a blessing. A state much happier than that in which thousands and millions of infants have lived in this world ; for there have been multitudes so circumstanced in time as that their existence was no blessing to them. And yet this sentiment of Augustine you have quoted to prove that Calvin believed, and that those who are called by his name, now believe, that infants not a span long are sent to the fierce torments of an eternal hell ! And it is after such splendid exhibitions of knowledge in ecclesiastical history, and of skill in translation, and accuracy in reasoning, that the reviewer celebrates his triumph, &c.’ pp. 88, 89.

Here, as we mean to show, Dr Beecher charges us with misrepresenting a writer, with whose sentiments on the point in question he is at the same time giving proof incontestible that he of himself knows absolutely nothing. In the first place, he did not take the two quotations he has mixed up with Latin of his own, directly from Augustin. He took them from Ridgley’s *Body of Divinity*. Or, if he did not take them from that work, he must have taken them either from some one who did, or from some one from whom Ridgley himself took them. At all

* ‘I am horror struck ! Never, never. I said in my book, *Contra Julianum*, lib. i. cap. 16, “It may, therefore, be truly said, that infants, departing from the body without being baptized, will be in a condemnation of all most mild ;” and in lib. v. cap. 8, I have said, “I do not say that infants, dying without Christian baptism, will be filled with such punishment as will make it expedient rather that they had never been born.” I am astonished—I am indignant—that I should be represented as having taught that infants suffer the full torments of hell. Oh, the degeneracy of the times !’—It is in this passage, it will be perceived, that our learned critic upon *absque remedio* and the importance of ‘collocation,’ as a means of elucidating Latin sentences, gives us his *damnatione mitissime*, and his ‘filled with punishment,’ for *pœnâ plectendos*.

events, he did not take them directly from Augustin. In the Body of Divinity they stand in a note, thus ;—

‘* See *Aug. contra Julianum, Lib. V. cap. 8. Ego non dico, parvulos sine baptismo Christi morientes tantâ pœnâ esse plectendos, ut eis non nasci potius expediret. Et Ejus. de peccat. merit. et remiss. Lib. I. cap. 16. Potest proinde rectè dici, parvulos sine baptismo de corpore ex-euntes, in damnatione omnium mitissimâ futuros.*’*

Now if the reader will compare these citations as given by Ridgley, with the same as given by Dr Beecher, he will perceive that, except in punctuation, of which Dr Beecher is habitually careless, and his *mitissime* for *mitissimâ*, accounted for in our last number, they are in all respects precisely alike. This circumstance, we allow, is in itself nothing to our purpose, because the accordance admits of explanation on the ground that Ridgley and Dr Beecher both copied immediately from Augustin. But it so happens that both writers have fallen into the same mistake of transcription, both giving us *baptismo Christi* for *Christi baptisate*, as it stands in every edition of Augustin we have examined. † Besides, Ridgley refers, for one of the quotations, to *Lib. V. cap. 8*, where the words do not occur, instead of *Lib. V. cap. 11*, where they are to be found, and Dr Beecher, much to our inconvenience, adopted his error. Nor is this all. In order to conceal his plagiarism, our author, who is ‘not disposed to stand about trifles,’ was at the pains of transposing the quotations, so that the one which Ridgley put first, is by him put last, and *vice versâ*. But in doing this, he unfortunately committed a blunder, which only the more completely discovers what he was endeavouring to hide. For Ridgley, except in giving *cap. 8*. for *cap. 11.*, made his references correctly. But Dr Beecher, in transposing the citations, dropped the *title* of the *Lib. I.* to which Ridgley had referred him, and put the quotation from that book under the title of the *Lib. V.* to which Ridgley had referred him, so that he gives us a reference to the *sixteenth* chapter of the first book of Augustin *Against Julian*, when, if our learned author had looked into the original, he might have seen, that *nine* chapters are all which that book contains. This is bad enough, but, worse still, we are referred to Augustin’s work *Against Julian*, for a passage which was in fact taken, by Ridgley, from his work *Concerning the Deserts*

* Ridgley’s Body of Divinity, vol. i. Quest. xxvii. p. 345. Ed. 1731.

† Ridgley also gives us *Ego non dico*, instead of *Ego autem non dico*, as Augustin wrote it. This, however, was done designedly, because *autem* refers to something Augustin had before said, which Ridgley did not wish to notice. Dr Beecher has also omitted the same word, but, since he may have had the same reason for it, we have made no account of the circumstance.

and Remission of Sin,—an awkwardness which our author might have avoided, had he implicitly followed his guide, instead of attempting to appear to have made his discoveries by his own independent researches. However, the circumstances we have detailed, when taken together, demonstrate, to our minds, that Dr Beecher, although he speaks of the sentiments of Augustin with an assurance evidently intended to pass with his readers for the confidence of truth, has, in so far as his quotations are concerned, given us no proof whatever, that he has ever looked into the works of that father, not to speak of the conclusive evidence they afford to the contrary. Having himself spoken of our 'splendid exhibitions of knowledge in ecclesiastical history,' he will doubtless thank us for returning the compliment, in thus pointing out his.

Such, then, is the controvertist, who charges us with intentional misquotation and mistranslation, with speaking of the sentiments of a writer with 'unauthorised confidence,' and a pitiful conspiracy 'to put out the only light to redeem a certain passage from perversion;' who 'follows us through our windings,' 'exposes our ignorance and weakness,' 'writes to apprise us of what we ought to have known long since,' compassionately tells us how we 'might have escaped the downfall, into which we have so heedlessly plunged,' and, in conclusion, animadvert upon 'such instances of moral obliquity,' as our charging Calvin, Turretin, and others, with believing in the damnation of infants—a charge, which, says this indignant vindicator of the 'holy dead,' 'is UTTERLY FALSE; and, [not] KNOWING it to be such, *I* have publicly denied it!'

But, to return to our argument, Dr Beecher discovers just as familiar an acquaintance with the works of Augustin, by what he says 'he in fact taught,' as by the mode in which he came by his two quotations from that author. Indeed we strongly suspect, though we of course shall not affirm, that he took both comment and text from the very same source. At all events, the doctrine he ascribes to Augustin, is precisely that laid down in Ridgley's *Body of Divinity*, as will be seen when we produce that 'approved Calvinistic writer,' as an authority for the future punishment of infants. Ridgley saw, most clearly, that infant damnation, in some shape, clung inseparably to the Calvinistic system. But he was probably one of the 'two dissenting divines,' who were thought by Edwards to have virtually given up a cardinal point of Calvinism, in hesitating to make thorough work of it, and consign the little masses of corruption to the full torments of hell. He was a Calvinist, but his humanity struggled

hard with his love of consistency, and so far got the mastery, as to induce him to soften, as well as he might, the rigors of his system, though it could not persuade him wholly to abandon its unnatural dogmas. Guilty as they were in Adam, he dared not deny that the little babes would hereafter be punished; but he hoped it would be gently, that God would not cast them into eternal fires, that 'their damnation,' to use Dr Beecher's excellent summary of his doctrine, 'would consist chiefly, if not entirely, in the loss of that holy enjoyment in heaven, for which their depravity disqualified them, and if they suffered a positive evil at all, that it would be of the very mildest kind, and such as would render their eternal existence on the whole a blessing.' Such was Ridgley's doctrine, and we could not have had, in so narrow a compass, a fairer or fuller representation of it, than Dr Beecher has himself given us in these words. But what was the doctrine of Augustin? Did *he* make it a question, whether infants would 'suffer a positive evil at all,' or hold that their 'damnation would consist chiefly, if not entirely, in the loss of holy enjoyment in heaven,' or did he, on the contrary, 'send them to the gloom and torments of a "Calvinistic hell?"' That he excluded such as have not been baptized, from heaven, although they might die in such circumstances as rendered their baptism impossible, we have already shown in our review; and this, we did think, would be enough to satisfy any Calvinist, that he must have consigned them to hell. But Dr Beecher tells us it did not satisfy him, and he thinks the two quotations he picked up in Ridgley, abundantly prove that we have made an unauthorised use of that father's name. For, 'Did you, Sir,' says he to Augustin, *did* you 'believe and teach that infants are damned, meaning by the term damnation—a condition of excessive and unmingled suffering, *bodily* and mental?' 'Never,' is the word Dr Beecher gets in reply, and then, in support of his denial, we are offered Augustin's 'mildest damnation of all.' But what a pitiful attempt at evasion have we here! Because Augustin believed the damnation of infants would be of the mildest kind, therefore we have misrepresented him in saying, that he believed infants would be damned—though this, as Dr Beecher well knew, was all we said, or meant to say, or were required by our argument to prove! Why, if our author, so learned in the doctrines of the Fathers, had but looked into the original for one of his own quotations, he would have seen that Augustin himself, in the same breath in which he utters the words that were cited by Ridgley, gives his *reader* a caution against the very perversion of his language of which Dr Beecher has been guilty;—

'It may therefore be truly said, that infants dying without baptism, will be in a state of damnation of all the most mild. But,' Augustin immediately adds, 'GREATLY DOES HE DECEIVE and *is he deceived*, who affirms that they *will not be damned*.'*

In connexion with the second quotation, Augustin tells us that even some baptized infants will be damned. His opponent, it seems, had compared parents to homicides, in that they were the occasion of bringing their children into a state of damnation. But, said Augustin, the same reproach may with greater justice be cast upon the goodness of God—

'who is certainly the author of all good, and yet does not refrain from creating those whom he foreknew were to BURN IN ETERNAL FIRES; nor is anything but goodness imputed to him, because he creates them. And even some BAPTIZED INFANTS, whom he foreknew would prove apostates, he does not take out of this life and adopt into his eternal kingdom, nor confer upon them the great blessing granted to him of whom it is said, "Speedily was he taken away, lest that wickedness should alter his understanding."†

He then contends, that parents are even less to blame than God, because they do not foreknow what the fate of their children is to be, which cannot be said in excuse of the Deity, and goes on to notice another objection to continuing the species, arising from the saying of our Saviour, 'That it had been better for that man if he had never been born.' To this he replies, that his being born was more the act of God than of his parents, and argues, as before, from the foreknowledge of God, and the parents' ignorance of futurity. Then follows Ridgley's first, or Dr Beecher's second quotation, in these words;—

'But I do not say that infants dying without christian baptism, will have so great a punishment inflicted upon them that it would be better for them if they had never been born; since the Lord,' Augustin adds, 'has said this, not of sinners in general, *de quibuslibet peccatoribus*, but of the most wicked and abandoned. For if, as he says of the Sodomites, and surely did not wish to have understood of them alone, some will at the day of judgment be punished more enduringly than others, who will doubt but that unbaptized infants, who have no sin but original, and are not burdened with any of their own, will be in a state of damnation the lightest of all? Which, although *I cannot define what or how great* it will be, yet I dare not say that it would be better for them not to exist than to be there. But even you,' he says, 'who contend that they are exempt from all damnation, do not like to think with what a damnation you punish them, by alienating so many of God's images from the life of God and the kingdom of God.'‡

It seems, then, that Augustin, in the context of Ridgley's first

* De Peccat. Merit. et Remiss. Lib. I. c. 16.

† Contra Julianum, Lib. V. c. 10.

‡ Ibid. cap. 11.

quotation, which is the one we have last noticed, *opposes* the very doctrine which Dr Beecher asserts 'he in fact taught;' viz. that 'the damnation of infants consists chiefly, *if not entirely*, in the loss of holy enjoyment in heaven,' while, in immediate connexion with Ridgley's second quotation, he says, that he is **DECEIVED** and is a **DECEIVER**, who denies the doctrine of infant damnation. This, surely, is enough for our object, and we could not have asked for a quotation more directly to our purpose. So far, then, we do not 'see' that Augustin 'feels' either displeasure or surprise 'at our misrepresentation of him.' In connexion with one of the passages to which Ridgley and Dr Beecher have referred us, he even goes further than he did in that which we quoted, and says, not only that all unbaptized infants, but also that some baptized infants will be damned.

Let us next 'see how Augustin feels at our misrepresentation of him—as if he taught that infants were sent to the gloom and torments of a "Calvinistic hell"—a thing, by the by, which Dr Beecher is aware that we have never yet expressly *said* that he taught, though we do say it now, and prove it by the following quotation, in which he opposes, still more directly than in the last, the doctrine, which Dr Beecher seems to have thought must have been Augustin's doctrine, for no better reason than because Ridgley happened to find in the works of that father, a couple of expressions which described a particular feature of his own belief. The 'hard father of infants' is still combating the 'heresy,' as Turretin and all Calvinists call it, of Pelagius and his followers, and writes thus;—

'We affirm, that they [infants] will not be saved, and have eternal life, except they be baptized in Christ. * * * An infant, *they say*, although he may not be baptized, yet on account of his innocence, in that he is wholly without sin, whether personal or original, whether of himself or derived from Adam, such an one, say they, must necessarily be saved and have eternal life, although he may not be baptized; but he is therefore to be baptized, that he may enter even into the kingdom of God, that is, into the kingdom of heaven. * * * When they say, that they [infants] are not to be baptized for the sake of receiving salvation and eternal life, but only for entrance into the kingdom of heaven and the kingdom of God,—they indeed confess that they ought to be baptized, but not on account of eternal life, but for the sake of the kingdom of heaven. What do they say of eternal life? They shall have it, say they. Wherefore shall they have it? Because they have no sin, and cannot belong to the number of the damned, *ad damnationem pertinere non possunt*. Therefore,' says Augustin, 'there is eternal life out of the kingdom of heaven!'

'This first error must be refused admittance to your ears, must be rooted out of your minds. This new doctrine, that there is eternal life independent of the kingdom of heaven, that there is eternal salvation independent of the kingdom of God, was never before heard of in the church. First, see, brother, whether perchance you ought not hence to agree

with us, that whosoever does not belong to the kingdom of God, must, without doubt, belong to the number of the damned. The Lord will come, and, about to judge the living and the dead, will, according to the gospel, make two divisions, the right and the left. To those on the left he will say, *Depart into EVERLASTING FIRE prepared for the devil and his angels.* To those on the right, he will say, *Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom which was prepared for you from the foundation of the world.* The one he calls a kingdom, the other damnation with the devil. **THERE IS NO MIDDLE PLACE LEFT, WHERE YOU CAN PUT INFANTS. * * *** Behold, on the right is the kingdom of heaven. *Inherit*, he says, *the kingdom.* He who is not there, is on the left. What will happen on the left? *Depart into everlasting fire.* On the right, an eternal kingdom; on the left, everlasting fire. He that is not on the right, will indisputably be on the left. *Therefore he that is not in the kingdom, IS DOUBTLESS IN ETERNAL FIRE.* Certainly he cannot have eternal life, who is not baptized; he will not be on the right, that is, he will not be in the kingdom. * * * In his [the Lord's] last sentence, that he might teach what is the kingdom, and what eternal fire, he says, [Matt. xxv. 46,] *Then these shall go away into everlasting burning, but the righteous into life eternal.*

'Behold, he [the Lord] has explained to you what is the kingdom, and what is everlasting fire, so that when you confess that an infant will not be in the kingdom, you may allow that **HE WILL BE IN ETERNAL FIRE. * * ***

'I feel that this question is a profound one, and I own that my powers are not sufficient to fathom its depths. I must here be content to exclaim with Paul, *O the depth of the riches!* **AN UNBAPTIZED INFANT GOES TO DAMNATION.***

This, then, is Augustin's way of representing 'the damnation of infants as consisting chiefly, if not entirely, in the loss of that holy enjoyment in heaven for which their depravity disqualified them.' There has indeed been a wonderful 'change of views and language' taking place in these days, and when things are called by their right names, we shall expect to hear of a sect of Pelagian Calvinists, as the result of Dr Beecher's learned labors upon Ridgley's Body of Divinity. This 'splendid exhibition' of logic and learning, reminds us of Benedict Turretin's remarks upon a similar one by Father Coton, the Jesuit. 'St Augustin,' says Turretin, 'has rigorously condemned all infants dying without baptism, not only to such a punishment as the schoolmen imagine, but a much worse. What is more, he combats their distinction, opposing the Pelagians, who said that the privation of baptism excluded them from the kingdom of heaven, but did not lock them up in hell. Who would not laugh at an argument like this? Augustin holds, "that infants dying without baptism, are punished with the punishment of ETERNAL FIRE," De Fide, ad Pet. cap. 27, and Coton would infer a hell, where there is no punishment of sense, but only that of loss. *What sense has Coton, to think of prov-*

* De Baptismo Parvulorum contra Pelagianos. Sermo D. August. xiv. capp. 2, 3, 4, and 7.

ing that they will have no punishment of *sense*, by the authority of him who condemns them to the *punishment of fire*? If Coton were in the fire, in what kind of punishment would he be there? that of *sense* or of *loss*? * So too, if consigning infants to everlasting burnings, is not consigning them 'to the gloom and torments of a "Calvinistic hell,"' we should be glad to be told what is. Till Dr Beecher has shown that it is not, however, we must believe that we have demonstrated what we attempted to prove; viz. that he has in these Letters given us no evidence that he ever even looked into the works of Augustin which he pretends to quote, and that his own attempt to neutralize the authority of that father as a believer in infant damnation, is not only a total failure, but a failure, which, let it do him what honor it may as a man, certainly reflects upon him no credit whatever as a scholar. This is plain language, it is true; but if any one is disposed to blame us for using it, let him reflect that he hears but the plain language of FACTS before him, and that it is therefore not we, but Dr Beecher, who should be held accountable for its character, even were it much plainer than we have yet made it to be.

It would be easy to produce other ancient authorities for the doctrine in question, but we shall quote but one more, that of Fulgentius, who was born about forty years after Augustin died, and was a theologian of the same school. There is a raciness about his expressions, which is worthy of the great perfecter of the system, Calvin himself. He frequently, and with the utmost unconcern, speaks of God's condemning infants to 'eternal damnation,' 'eternal torments,' 'eternal burning,' &c.; but there is one passage, which, except in making baptism absolutely necessary to salvation, gives us so exactly the genuine Calvinistic doctrine on this subject, that we shall content ourselves with giving that alone. In one of his works, he gives a catalogue of Orthodox articles of faith, beginning each of the forty 'heads' of which it consists, with the words *Firmissime tene et nullatenus dubites*, 'most firmly hold, and by no means doubt.' The passage to which we refer, makes one of the forty, and is as follows;—

'Most firmly hold, and by no means doubt, not only that men who have come to the use of reason, but also that INFANTS, whether they begin to live in their mothers' wombs *and there die*, or, after being born, pass from this life without the sacrament of holy baptism, which is given in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, WILL BE PUNISHED WITH THE EVERLASTING PUNISHMENT OF ETERNAL FIRE; because, although they had no sin of their own committing, they have nevertheless incurred, by their carnal conception and nativity, the damnation of original sin.' †

* *Defense de la Fidelité des Traductions de la S. Bible faites à Geneve.* Par B. Turretin. Verification xli.

† Fulgentius de Fide ad Pet. Diac. cap. xxvii.

This, we say, excepting what relates to baptism, is genuine Calvinism. For it is human nature itself, the created living mass, which is odious and abominable to God, and no matter whether it has existed for years or only for an instant, it is equally hateful in the eyes of its Creator, its sinfulness is still total, and it is therefore equally deserving of unspeakable torments in hell fire forever. We shall not stop to prove by quotations from Calvin, that he, like Fulgentius, did not think it necessary that the infant should be born in order to be damnable; for the fact is well known. The citations we have already made from his works establish it beyond a question, and it is from this part of his doctrine, undoubtedly, that the traditional expression that 'there are infants in hell not a span long,' has arisen. Whether it has ever been adopted by Calvinists, or is only an expression used by their opponents to set their 'horrible decree' in a striking light, we do not pretend to determine. That it is an expression, which ought not to shock any consistent, thorough Calvinist, we are sure. But this is a departure from the course we promised to pursue, which requires us, before producing additional authorities, to reexamine those we originally cited.

Our next quotations were made, with the single exception of Twiss,* from 'approved Calvinistic writers' of a later date. These, with his usual accuracy, Dr Beecher supposes were contained in Professor Norton's views of Calvinism, a work which our author tells us he has lately 'read, with a full purpose, if such quotations as he [the reviewer] alleges, were contained in it, to admit frankly his mistake.' But, if Dr Beecher has read it, will he 'frankly' explain to us, how he could suppose it contained our *quotations* from later *writers*, when the fact is, that only one out of the four is to be found in its pages? This, for aught we know, may be a 'trifle;' but Dr Beecher should have remembered, that, while bringing against us a charge of 'falsehood,' it became him, of all men, to be extremely careful that 'trifles' like these, should not be of such frequent occurrence. The later authority for which we were indebted to the Views of Calvinism, was that of Edwards; a writer, whose sentiments, as Dr Beecher contends, we have as grossly misrepresented as we did those of Augustin, Calvin, and Turretin. For once we are glad we have an opportunity to establish the correctness, instead of

* The language of our review implies that Twiss, who died in 1646, was a later writer than Turretin, who died in 1687. We also gave a wrong translation of the title of Twiss's 'Vindication of the Grace, Power, and Providence of God.' We were led into the mistake by the title having been incorrectly printed in the Christian Disciple, from which we copied.

exposing the errors, of our author, and we shall endeavour to show that Edwards was no more, but just as much, of a believer in infant damnation as the writers just mentioned. Let us first quote all that Dr Beecher has said in relation to Edwards, as he was cited in our review. It is as follows ;—

‘Especially do I call for the proof that EDWARDS gives up infants to “the full torments of hell.” The passage quoted from Edwards in proof contains no such sentiment. He is replying to two “dissenting divines, of no inconsiderable note,” one of whom supposed that only so much sin of Adam was imputed, as justified the miseries of this life, and of death, or annihilation; the other supposing that no imputation can be consistent with the divine perfections which avers that the future state of infants should be worse than nonexistence.

“But this to me,” he says, “appears plainly to be giving up that grand point of the imputation of Adam’s sin, both in whole and in part. For it supposes it to be not right for God to bring any evil on a child of Adam, which is innocent as to personal sin, without paying for it, or balancing it with good; so that still the state of the child shall be as good as could be demanded in justice, in case of mere innocence. Which plainly supposes that the child is not exposed to any proper punishment at all, or is not at all in debt to divine justice, on account of Adam’s sin.”*

‘But, in this passage, what does Edwards say? Simply and only, as all the Reformers had said, that infants are *exposed* justly to eternal death on account of original sin; but that they *suffer* this deserved punishment HE DOES NOT SAY. And yet, such is the authority which the reviewer claims, as “directly and completely to his purpose,” to prove that Edwards gave up infants to the torments of hell.’—pp. 89, 90.

Of what ‘the Reformers said’ we shall speak more fully hereafter, it being enough to remark here, that Dr Beecher shows himself but superficially, if at all, acquainted with their belief on this subject. With regard to Edwards, we grant that in the passage we quoted, which is that given by Dr Beecher, he *does not expressly say*, that infants must suffer the ‘torments of hell;’ but that he believed it, is a conclusion irresistibly forced upon us by his reasoning in that passage and the context, and we must therefore still be permitted to claim him as an authority ‘directly and completely to our purpose.’ And here we are compelled to remark, that Dr Beecher’s mode of conducting this controversy, is, throughout, more like that of a man intent upon beating down his adversary, than of one anxious to establish the truth. For what if Edwards does not *expressly say*, that infants must be eternally punished in hell fire? The question is not about what he has *said*, but what he *believed*, and this can be made as evident in a course of reasoning without a direct expression of it, as by the plainest and most unqualified assertions. Instead of letting the matter rest upon his bare denial, therefore,

* ‘Edwards on Original Sin. Works, vol. vi. p. 462.’

it would have evinced a greater desire to come to the real truth in the case, if Dr Beecher had given us an analysis of the whole course of Edwards's reasoning in the context, and shown, in his favorite 'logical form,' that it conducts a fair minded man to no such conclusion as that for which we have contended. But, what is worse, he does not even attempt to show that the ground is untenable, on which Professor Norton, in the extract we made from him, produced Edwards at all, as an authority in this question. That ground was, that Edwards *opposed* the belief of 'some more tender-hearted Calvinists,' that the 'future condition,' the *actual* future condition of infants, not the condition they were *exposed* to, 'would not be worse than non-existence.' Edwards, we say, *opposed* this doctrine, because, among other reasons, it implies that 'the state of the child *shall be as good as could be demanded in justice in case of mere innocence.*' The conclusion is therefore inevitable, that he must himself have believed in a future 'state of the child,' NOT 'as good as could be demanded in justice in case of mere innocence,' and we shall soon see that that 'worse state than non-existence,' was, in his view, a state of 'PERFECT AND ETERNAL MISERY.' The distinction of which Dr Beecher speaks, between a liability or just exposure to punishment, and its actual infliction, is neither insisted upon, nor even noticed, either by Edwards or the 'two divines' upon whose theories he is remarking. On the contrary, one of them believed that infants would actually be annihilated at death, and the other, that they would, after death, actually be punished, though not so severely as to 'make their state in another world *worse than non-existence.*' The first was Watts, and the second Ridgley, as already mentioned. Neither of them believed all infants would be saved, neither of them believed *any* would be saved except they were children of believers, and one of them, Ridgley, thought it unreasonable to suppose all of the latter description would be saved. They are, therefore, both of them, good authorities against Dr Beecher on this subject; but, on the ground that they do not go far enough, they are both opposed by Edwards, who, in regard to the theory of Watts, has the following remarks;—

'I would observe, that to suppose, God imputes not all the guilt of Adam's sin, but only some little part of it, relieves nothing but one's imagination. To think of poor little infants bearing such torments for Adam's sin, as they sometimes do in this world, and these torments ending in death and annihilation, may sit easier on the imagination, than to conceive of their SUFFERING ETERNAL MISERY for it. But it does not at all relieve one's reason. There is no rule of reason that can be supposed to lie against imputing a sin in the whole of it, which was com-

mitted by one, to another who did not personally commit it, but what will also lie against its being so imputed and *punished* in part.*

Now it does seem to us impossible that any one could have written this paragraph, in the circumstances in which Edwards wrote it, unless he were a believer in the doctrine that infants are given up to the full torments of hell. He had been replying to 'that great objection against the imputation of Adam's sin to his posterity—that such imputation is unjust and unreasonable, inasmuch as Adam and his posterity are not one and the same.' In the course of his remarks, he had said, that 'things were wisely so established, that all should naturally be in one and the same moral state; and not in such exceeding different states, as that some should be—in a confirmed state of perfect happiness, but others in a state of public condemnation to *perfect and eternal misery*'—which latter is the condition into which he believed all mankind were brought by Adam's sin. Having removed the 'great objection' above-mentioned, he thought it 'not improper to add something—concerning the opinions of two divines, of no inconsiderable note among the Dissenters in England, relating to a partial imputation of Adam's first sin.'

'One of them,' [Watts] he says, 'supposes that this sin, though truly imputed to *INFANTS*, so that thereby they are exposed to a proper punishment, yet is not imputed to them in such a degree, as that upon this account they should be liable to eternal punishment, as Adam himself was, but only to temporal death, or annihilation; Adam himself, the immediate actor, being made infinitely more guilty by it, than his posterity.'†

Here, it is true, he uses the words 'exposed' and 'liable;' but he uses them in a way which shows that the distinction upon which Dr Beecher insists, was not in his mind. For not only does Watts, against whom he is writing, make no such distinction, but, as we have already remarked, he believed in the *actual infliction* of the 'proper punishment' of which Edwards speaks. Besides, in this same sentence, in which Edwards talks of infants' liability to 'eternal punishment,' he also speaks of their liability to 'temporal death.' But will Dr Beecher be consistent with himself, and to the question, 'What, in this passage, does Edwards say?' return the answer, 'Simply and only—that infants are *exposed* justly to temporal death; but that they *suffer* this deserved punishment HE DOES NOT SAY?' Yet if Edwards used the words loosely, and without reference to Dr Beecher's distinction, in the one case, why may he not have done so in the other? If, consistently with his convictions of the truth, he could

* Edwards's Works, vol. vi. p. 461.

† Ibid. p. 460.

have availed himself of that distinction, he had not only a fair opportunity, but was even called upon to do it. For Watts, in his 'Advertisement' to the work in which he maintains the doctrine of infant annihilation, says ;—

'I have endeavoured throughout this whole composure to *relieve and soften* all the harsher, and more obnoxious parts of this doctrine of original sin, and several other articles of our religion dependent upon it.' And again ;— 'I have also ventured to preclude, or to cut off some of the harder and more offensive consequences that have been *often* drawn or forced from these articles.' It is evident that these points have been sometimes carried into extremes, and the explication of them has not always been well limited and guarded.*

One of these 'harsher and more obnoxious,' or 'harder and more offensive' consequences, doubtless was, the Calvinistic doctrine that infants dying in their 'lost estate by nature,' are punished 'in hell fire forever.' Watts could not but acknowledge that the impossibility of their salvation was the natural and inevitable result of his Calvinistic principles. But how earnestly and touchingly does he plead for their rescue from that intense and everlasting anguish, to which a rigid interpretation of his system would consign them !

'In the mean time, while they are deemed infants, and have no personal sin, or obedience of their own, but only lie under the sentence of death for the sin of Adam, so far as it is imputed to them, let us not send any of their little souls into a separate state of torment, as soon as death has seized their bodies, without an express divine warrant: Nor let us raise up their bodies again from the dead, and then doom them, soul and body, to intense anguish and everlasting fire and sorrow, merely for Adam's sin, unless we can find some very evident sentence of this kind passed upon them in the word of God. The equity and the compassion of a God, so far as we can judge of it by the light of reason, would not inflict so severe and eternal a punishment on these little creatures, who are personally innocent or free from actual sin: And unless we can find some divine revelation that pronounces it with great strength and evidence, let us not so far contradict the gentler dictates of nature and reason, as to assert this opinion for truth, nor impose it on our own belief, nor on the belief of others. Let us try then, whether we cannot find out some milder punishment for their share of the guilt of Adam, in the bible.'†

Again ;—

'They cannot suffer any self-reproaches for sin, for they have committed none: Nor can this be conveyed to them by any imputed guilt of Adam, though it is a very great part of the punishment of souls for actual sin, as being the natural effect of personal transgression and guilt. If therefore they are punished for Adam's sin in another world, it must probably be by actual pains and torments inflicted on them by God himself, since the most natural effects of sin, that is, guilt and anguish of conscience, cannot reach them: And is it agreeable to the nature and mercy of a God to inflict such positive and endless pains or torments with his

* Ruin and Recovery of Mankind, Advertisement concerning the Sec. Ed.

† Ibid. Quest. xvi.

own hand, on such little creatures, who are free from all personal iniquity, and have no other crime but that they were born of Adam ?' *

In another place he writes as follows ;—

‘If I may freely speak my own sentiments here, I would say, since neither reason nor scripture, certainly and plainly teach us anything concerning the souls of the infants of wicked men after death ; and if I must not leave them in a state of non-existence, I would much rather chuse to suppose them at the death of the body entered into a new and personal state of trial, than I would condemn them to a wretched resurrection and eternal misery for nothing else, but because they were born of Adam, the original transgressor.’ *

‘Upon the whole, the opinion of the salvation of all children, as it has no countenance from the bible, so it has no foundation in the reason of things. * * * The scripture brings down the infants of wicked parents to the grave, and leaves them there, and so do I : The scripture has not provided any resurrection for them, neither can I do it.’ *

Watts, therefore, as remarked above, is a good authority against Dr Beecher for the actual future punishment of infants, although the state to which he supposed them to be reduced after death was a ‘state of non-existence,’ which he describes as ‘being the least demerit of imputed sin, or an everlasting forfeiture of life, and a sort of *endless punishment without pain.*’ He is an authority, because his attempt shows the tendency of his system. Throughout his remarks upon the subject, he is evidently opposing the arguments of Calvinists who held harsher doctrines, or, again to use his own words, who held to such ‘harder and more offensive consequences as *have been often drawn or forced*’ from Calvinistic principles. He is an authority, because he believed and taught that such children of wicked parents as die in infancy, will be punished for their share in Adam’s sin, and punished to the extent of their deserts ; and this is all that was ever believed or taught by the most rigid asserter of infant damnation, even when these little ones are called ‘vessels of wrath and firebrands of hell.’ † Both go to the extent of their principles, and the principles of both are Calvinistic at the bottom.

Now if Edwards either believed that all infants would be saved, or doubted whether any would be damned, he could not have had a fairer opportunity to say so, than when thus writing against the less severe hypothesis of Watts. Nay, the touching appeals of that writer, were so many, and, one would think, irresistible calls upon him to represent the future condition of infants as favorably as his principles would any way allow. For, without some expression either of hope or of doubt, he must have known that it would inevitably be inferred that he had

* Ruin and Recovery. Quest. xvi.

† Arthur Hildersham.

neither hope nor doubt to express. But not only has he given us no intimation of the one or the other, but on the contrary has dropped expressions which no man could have used, unless he believed in the very 'extremes' from which the writer he was opposing was endeavouring to escape by every means that his ingenuity, prompted by the deepest and tenderest interest in the subject upon which it was employed, could suggest. Nay, there is even an appearance of sarcasm in the mode in which he opens his attack upon Watts's gentler theory. For Watts had said that he had 'endeavoured to *relieve* and soften all the harsher and more obnoxious parts of his doctrine,' and Edwards in reply tells him, that he '*relieves nothing* but one's imagination,' 'and does not *relieve* one's reason at all;' that to conceive of the temporal 'torments of poor little infants as ending in death and annihilation, may sit easier on the *imagination*, than to conceive of their *suffering eternal misery* for it, but it does not at all *relieve* one's reason;' and all this he says, without so much as a hint that the latter conception is not as truly descriptive of *his* views of their actual future condition, as he knew the former was of those entertained by Watts. Watts thought it unwarrantable, unjust, and cruel, to punish infants, for mere imputed guilt, as severely as if their sin was of their own committing, though he believed they deserved to be punished, and that all the punishment they deserved would be actually inflicted. Edwards defends his system on the ground of its going to the very extreme against which Watts was so earnestly contending, and that too, both as regards the imputation and the punishment. 'There is no rule of reason,' he says, 'that can be supposed to lie against imputing a sin in the whole of it,—but what will also lie against its being so imputed and *punished* in part.' And again;—'There is no reason to be brought, why one man's sin cannot be justly reckoned to another's account, who was not then in being, in the *whole* of it; but what will as properly lie against its being reckoned to him in any part, so as that he should be *subject* to any condemnation or *punishment* on that account.'—'All the difference there can be,' he contends, 'is this; that to bring a *great punishment* on infants for Adam's sin, is a great act of injustice, and to bring a comparatively *small punishment*, is a smaller act of injustice, but not, that this is not as truly and demonstrably an act of injustice, as the other.' Not a saving clause for 'poor little infants,' as he contemptuously calls them, does he give us, from the beginning of the discussion to the end, and his not giving one, in such circumstances, is proof that he could not.

So too with respect to Edwards's opposition to 'the other di-

vine,' whom we suppose to be Ridgley. The mode in which he conducts it, and the fact that it is an opposition to the principles of a kind of mitigated infant damnation, on the ground that they do not go far enough, prove that he believed infants are damned according to the common acceptation of the term, by which is meant that they are punished in hell fire forever. Ridgley introduces his theory by remarking, that the punishment due to original sin, *as such*, is not distinguished from the greater degree of punishment which is due to its increasing guilt, 'by many who treat on this subject; which gives occasion to some, who deny original sin, to represent it in the most terrible view, as though there was no difference between the wrath of God, that infants are exposed to, and that which is inflicted on the most obdurate sinner.'* He then, in order to 'remove prejudices against this doctrine' of original sin, gives those views of the actual future punishment of infants, of which Dr Beecher presented us with so excellent a summary, while pretending to give the doctrine of Augustin. But in the mind of Edwards, he neither produced conviction, nor excited compassion. For,—

'The other divine,' says Edwards, 'thinks there is truly an imputation of Adam's sin, so that INFANTS cannot be looked upon as innocent creatures; yet seems to think it not agreeable to the perfections of God, to *make the state of infants in another world*, worse than nonexistence. But this to me,' he adds, and they are the words we quoted in our review, and which stand in the last extract from Dr Beecher, 'this to me appears plainly a giving up that grand point of the imputation of Adam's sin, both in whole and in part. For it supposes it to be not right, for God to bring any *evil* on a child of Adam, which is innocent as to personal sin, without *paying for it*, or balancing it with good; so that still the state of the child shall be as good, as could be demanded in justice, in case of mere innocence. Which plainly supposes that the child is not exposed to any proper *punishment* at all, or is not at all in debt to divine justice, on the account of Adam's sin. For if the child were truly in debt, then surely justice might take something from him without paying for it, or without giving that which makes its state *as good*, as mere innocence could in justice require. If he owes the suffering of some *punishment*, then there is no need that justice should requite the infant for suffering that punishment; or make up for it, by conferring some *good*, that shall counteract it, and in effect remove and disannul it; so that, on the whole, good and evil shall be at an even balance, yea, so that the scale of good shall preponderate. If it is unjust in a judge to order any quantity of money to be taken from another without paying him again, and fully making it up to him, it must be because he had justly forfeited none at all.'†

This is all that Edwards says with particular reference to the theory of Ridgley. The main point of his attention, indeed, is the justice or injustice of making the state of infants worse than a state of nonexistence. But he maintains that it is just to make it worse than nonexistence, and that in opposition to a

writer who believed that their state would be a state of actual punishment. Take this circumstance in connexion with the facts, that Ridgley wrote expressly to guard against the very extreme of doctrine, which, as we contend, Edwards adopts, and that Edwards gives not even a hint that infants, consistently with his own principles, will not after all actually suffer the 'perfect and eternal misery' they deserve, and the conclusion is inevitable that he consigned them to the torments of hell; and, that they will be the '*full torments of hell*,' is put beyond a doubt by the following extract, in which he carries out his system with so thorough and revolting a consistency. The passage immediately follows the one last quoted, and is the summing up of his doctrine of imputation as opposed to that of Watts and Ridgley.

'It seems to me pretty manifest that none can, in good consistence with themselves, own a real imputation of the guilt of Adam's first sin to his posterity, without owning that they are justly viewed and TREATED as sinners, truly guilty and children of wrath on that account; nor unless they allow a just imputation of the whole of the evil of that transgression; at least all that pertains to the essence of that act, as a full and complete violation of the covenant which God had established; *even as much as if each one of mankind had the like covenant established with him singly, and had by the like direct and full act of rebellion, violated it for himself.*'*

The doctrine of Edwards, then, is, that INFANTS are just as guilty as Adam himself was; that they consequently deserve the full punishment threatened him for his disobedience; that this punishment is death—death temporal and eternal, perfect, helpless, never ending misery; that upon that portion of them which God, in the exercise of his absolute but inscrutable sovereignty, will pass by and leave in their lost estate by nature, this terrible punishment will be inflicted; that 'the sight of' their

* Works, vol. vi. pp. 462—3. We are not alone in supposing Edwards's language and reasoning here show that he believed in infant damnation. Indeed, who, but a writer driven to extremity, could think of disputing it? The following extract is from a work on the 'Calvinistic and Arminian Controversy,' by Bishop White, of Pennsylvania. The writer notices President Edwards's 'consistency in his pursuing of his principles into all their consequences. From these,' he adds, 'a very great proportion of the advocates of the system will always turn aside with horror; however consenting to the principles from which they are fairly drawn. An instance of this his consistency, shall be given from the section of his book the last under discussion. He finds fault with the writings of two dissenting divines, whose names are not mentioned; and who, although they acknowledged the imputation of Adam's sin, could not reconcile themselves to the hard case of the damnation of infants. To get rid of this, they supposed, that the first sin was not imputed to infants in the same degree, as to Adam himself. One of the divines was in hopes of providing, in this way, a retreat for the little wretches, in annihilation. The other thought himself entitled to affirm, that their condition would not be worse than nonexistence. All this is much to the dissatisfaction of President Edwards; who, arguing more logically from the data held in common, rejects such softening expedients, invented for the easing of the feelings of humanity.'—vol. i. pp. 395, 6.

'hell torments will exalt the happiness of the saints forever,' who will thus be enabled to partake of it with 'a more lively relish,' and God's 'vindictive justice, appear strict, exact, awful, terrible, and therefore GLORIOUS !' *

So much for Edwards 'as quoted by the reviewer.' We will now give two other passages from the same writer, which, whatever may be thought of those already cited, will, we trust, satisfy Dr Beecher himself that he was a believer in infant damnation. We produce them, however, not because we think them necessary, but because Dr Beecher 'especially' calls for the proof of Edwards's being an authority on this question, and because he is unquestionably one of the most important authorities of modern times. The first passage occurs in the course of his illustrations of another 'monstrous doctrine' of Calvinism; viz. that the calamities and sufferings of this life, to which infants, as well as adults, are not only exposed, but which they actually suffer, are, properly speaking, *punishments*. It is as follows;—

'We may well argue from these things, that INFANTS are not looked upon by God as sinless, but that they are by nature children of wrath, seeing this terrible evil comes so heavily on mankind in infancy. But besides these things, which are observable concerning the mortality of infants in general, there are some particular cases of the death of infants, which the scripture sets before us, that are attended with circumstances, in a peculiar manner giving evidences of the sinfulness of such, and their just exposedness to divine wrath. As particularly,

'The destroying of the INFANTS in Sodom, and the neighboring cities; which cities, destroyed in so extraordinary, miraculous, and awful a manner, are set forth as a signal example, of God's dreadful vengeance for sin, to the world in all generations; agreeable to that of the apostle, Jude, verse 7.' †

The text here referred to is in these words;—'Even as Sodom and Gomorrha, and the cities about them, in like manner giving themselves over to fornication, and going after strange flesh, are set forth for an example, SUFFERING THE VENGEANCE OF ETERNAL FIRE.' By the '*vengeance of eternal fire*,' there can be little doubt that Edwards meant what Dr Beecher calls 'the gloom and torments of a "Calvinistic hell."' To cut off all hope whatever as to the future condition of these 'little vipers,' ‡ he states and meets the objection, that in regard to their misery in this life, God might make it up to them in another world.

'To say here, that God could make it up to those infants in another world, must be an insufficient reply. For so he could as easily have made it up to Lot, or to ten or fifty righteous, if they had been destroyed

* See Edwards's celebrated Sermon on the Eternity of Hell Torments, in portraying which his imagination seems to run riot.

† Works, vol. vi. pp. 252-3.

‡ Works, vol. vi. p. 475.

in the same fire: Nevertheless it is plainly signified, *that this would not have been agreeable to the wise and holy proceedings of the judge of all the earth.**

The other passage to which we refer, is as follows;—

‘Merely persons’ being born in covenant, is no more evidence of their having moral sincerity, than saving grace. Yea, there is more reason to suppose the latter, than the former without it, in the infant children of believing parents. For the scripture gives us ground to think, that **SOME** INFANTS have the habit of saving grace, and that they have a new nature given them; but no reason at all to think, that ever God works any mere moral change in them, or infuses any habits of moral virtue without saving grace: And we know, they cannot come by moral habits in infancy, any other way than by immediate infusion: They cannot obtain them by human instruction, nor contract them by use and custom. And especially there is *no reason to think*, that the children of such as are visible saints, according to Mr Williams’s scheme, *have any goodness infused into them by God, of any kind.* For in his scheme, all that are morally sincere may lawfully receive the privileges of visible saints. But we have *no scripture grounds to suppose, that God will bless the children* of such parents as have nothing more than moral sincerity, *with either common or SAVING grace.* There are no promises of the covenant of grace made to such parents, either concerning themselves or their children.’†

‘Now then for the syllogism,’ to borrow from Dr Beecher at once a favorite expression, and a favorite mode of presenting an argument. 1. Without God’s ‘saving grace’ no one can be saved—all will certainly be damned. 2. Edwards here says that the infants of mere ‘morally sincere men,’ or ‘half Christians,’ as he calls them below, cannot have God’s saving grace. 3. Therefore Edwards believed that no such infants can be saved—that they will all be inevitably damned. There is no escaping the force of this reasoning, except by denying the first proposition, which asserts the necessity of saving grace. But this would be to deny a fundamental principle of Calvinism, which, with all the mutations of Orthodoxy, we have never yet seen denied by any one who claims to be called by the Calvinistic name.‡

(*To be continued.*)

* Works, pp. 253–4.

† Ibid. vol. i. pp. 497–8.

‡ Since our last sheet was struck off, we observe that we have spoken as if the extract on p. 331, contained absolutely ‘all Dr Beecher has said in relation to Edwards, as he was cited in our review.’ We had forgotten the following sentence in his first Letter, which however adds nothing to the extract we have given, and is virtually contained in it.—‘Edwards, also, as quoted, reprobates a sentiment which would deny that infants are ‘not exposed to any proper punishment at all on account of Adam’s sin.’ p. 47.

NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

35. A Discourse Delivered at the Installation of the Rev. Mellish Irving Motte, as Pastor of the South Congregational Society, in Boston, May 21, 1828. By William Ellery Channing. Second Edition. Boston, Bowles & Dearborn. 1828. 12mo. pp. 22.

THIS is a valuable sermon, though we do not consider it one of Dr Channing's most successful efforts. The prominent idea is an important one, though not of a novel character—that Christianity is designed to 'exert an influence on the human mind.' 'In this its glory chiefly consists.' There is and can be 'no greater work on earth, than to purify the soul from evil, and to kindle in it new light, life, energy, and love.' This end Christianity labors to accomplish. This might be shown by a general survey of its precepts and doctrines, but it is sufficient to take one feature, 'the knowledge it gives of the character of God.' This topic is pursued at some length, and some popular misapprehensions concerning the nature of religion pointed out. After showing the 'great purpose of the christian doctrine respecting God, or in what its importance and glory consists,' and observing that every other doctrine of our religion has the same end, 'a fruitful subject,' Dr Channing remarks, 'on which he cannot enter,' he proceeds;

'It has been my object in this discourse to lay open a great truth, a central, all comprehending truth of Christianity. Whoever intelligently and cordially embraces it, obtains a standard by which to try all other doctrines, and to measure the importance of all other truths. Is it so embraced? I fear not. I apprehend that it is dimly discerned by many who acknowledge it, whilst on many more it has hardly dawned. I see other views prevailing, and prevailing in a greater or less degree among all bodies of Christians, and they seem to me among the worst errors of our times. Some of these I would now briefly notice.' p. 15.

The first is that of those, who, 'instead of placing the glory of Christianity in the pure and powerful action, which it gives to the human mind, seem to think, that it is rather designed to substitute the activity of another for our own.'—'Now the great purpose of Christianity is, not to procure or offer to the mind a friend on whom it may passively lean, but to make the mind itself wise, strong, and efficient. Its end is, not that wisdom and strength, as subsisting in another, should do everything for us, but that these attributes

should grow perpetually in our own souls.' Again, there is a propensity in multitudes, 'to make a wide separation between religion, or christian virtue, and its rewards. That the chief reward lies in the very spirit of religion, they do not dream. They think of being Christians for the sake of something beyond the christian character, and something more precious.' In the third place,

'Men's ignorance of the great truth stated in this discourse, is seen in the low ideas attached by multitudes to the word *salvation*. Ask multitudes, what is the chief evil from which Christ came to save them, and they will tell you, "From hell, from penal fires, from future punishment." Accordingly they think, that salvation is something which another may achieve for them, very much as a neighbour may quench a conflagration that menaces their dwellings and lives. That word *hell*, which is used so seldom in the sacred pages, which, as critics will tell you, does not occur once in the writings of Paul, and Peter, and John, which we meet only in four or five discourses of Jesus, and which all persons acquainted with Jewish geography, know to be a metaphor, a figure of speech, and not a literal expression, this word, by a perverse and exaggerated use, has done unspeakable injury to Christianity.' p. 16.

On this passage the 'Spirit of the Pilgrims,' with its characteristic *fairness*, remarks,—'Now the truth is, this unfortunate English word, *hell*, occurs more than fifty times in our English translation of the bible; it is used both by Peter and John; and is inserted more than a dozen times in the record which is left us of the discourses of Jesus.* Admit this, admit that the '*English* word' occurs in our '*English* translation so many times.'—What is all this to the purpose? It does not in the least affect the correctness of Dr C.'s remark, in the sense in which, as the writer in the 'Spirit of the Pilgrims' must have known, he meant to be understood. He may have expressed himself a little incautiously; we think he has; he might have said, the corresponding word in the original, or the word properly translated *hell*, occurs but seldom. Such was obviously his meaning; and it is something worse than cavilling to put any other construction on his language. The word in the original, *γέεννα*, answering to our English word *hell*, does 'not occur

* Number for July, p. 391.

once in the writings of Paul and Peter, and John,' and is met with 'only in four or five discourses of Jesus,' though in one or two of those discourses it is repeated. In all, it occurs in the New Testament, twelve times—seven in Matthew, three in Mark, once in Luke, and once in James.* Of the seven instances of its use by Matthew three occur in the same discourse and same chapter, the fifth; again it occurs twice in the discourse recorded in the twenty-third chapter. Of the three instances in which it is used by Mark, all occur in the ninth chapter, and in one discourse of our Saviour, the same that is recorded by Matthew in the fifth chapter. The sum is this; according to Matthew our Saviour appears to have used the term on four occasions, or in four discourses. Mark mentions only one occasion, on which he used it, the same with one of those recorded by Matthew, and Luke mentions only one. It appears then that Jesus used it only on five occasions, at most, and in all the Epistles it occurs but once, and then in this connexion;—James observes of the tongue, that it 'setteth on fire the course of nature; and is set on fire of hell.' iii. 6.

There is another word, *ἄδης*, which king James's translators have sometimes rendered *hell*, but very improperly, as no one, who has the slightest tincture of biblical learning, will venture to deny. On the subject of these two words we cannot offer anything more to the purpose than the following observations of Dr Campbell, an eminent Trinitarian critic.

'The word *גֵּהֶנְמוֹת* does not occur in the Septuagint. It is not a Greek word, and consequently not to be found in the Grecian classics. It is originally a compound of the two Hebrew words *גֵּהֶנְמוֹת* *ge hinnom*, the valley of Hinnom, a place near Jerusalem, of which we hear first in the book of Joshua. It was there that the cruel sacrifices of children were made by fire to Moloch, the Ammonitish idol. The place was also called *Tophet*, and that, as is supposed, from the noise of drums, (*Toph* signifying a drum), a noise raised on purpose to drown the cries of the helpless infants.'

'As to the word *ἄδης*, which oc-

* Matt. v. 22, 29, 30. x. 28. xviii. 9. xxiii. 15, 34. Mark, ix. 43, 45, 47. Luke, xii. 5. James, ii. 6.

curs in eleven places in the New Testament, and is rendered *hell* in all, except one, where it is translated *grave*, it is quite common in classical authors, and frequently used by the Seventy, in the translation of the Old Testament. In my judgment, it ought never in the scripture to be rendered *hell*, at least in the sense wherein that word is now universally understood by Christians. In the Old Testament the corresponding word is *שְׁאוֹל* *sheol*, which signifies the state of the dead in general, without regard to the goodness or badness of the persons, their happiness or misery. In translating that word, the Seventy have almost invariably used *ἄδης*.† But it is very plain, that neither in the Septuagint version of the Old Testament nor in the New, does the word *ἄδης* convey the meaning which the present English word *hell*, in the christian usage, always conveys to our minds.—'Who would render the words of the venerable patriarch Jacob, when he was deceived by his sons into the opinion that his favorite child Joseph had been devoured by a wild beast, *I will go down to hell to my son mourning?* or the words, which he used, when they expostulated with him about sending his youngest son Benjamin into Egypt along with them; *Ye will bring down my gray hairs with sorrow to hell?* Yet in both of these places, the word in the original is *sheol*, and in the version of the Seventy, *hades*,'*—very inconsistently rendered *hell* in our common version, in several passages both of the Old and New Testament. It means the grave, or the place of the departed, without reference to their condition as happy or miserable. In the passages above quoted by Dr Campbell, it might have been translated *hell* with just as much propriety, as in several others in which it is so translated.†

There is another word, which occurs once, 2 Peter, ii. 4. and only once, in the New Testament, *ταρταρος*, rendered very improperly, 'cast down to hell.' It should have been translated, either 'thrust down to Tartarus,' or

* Dissert. vi. Part ii.

† The eleven places in which it occurs in the New Testament are, Matt. xi. 23. xvi. 18. Luke, x. 15. xvi. 23. Acts, ii. 27, 31. I Cor. xv. 55, translated *grave*, and Rev. i. 18. vi. 8. xx. 13, 14. It occurs in the Septuagint translation of the Old Testament between sixty and seventy times.

simply 'cast down,' which, according to Grotius, is all it here means. That the place, meant to be designated by it, was not *γέννηα*, hell, is evident from the words which immediately follow, which represent the fallen angels as reserved in it, as in a sort of prison house, till the final judgment. Now hell, *γέννηα*, or the state of suffering indicated by that figurative term, comes after judgment. So Dr Campbell. Peter then does not say, that the apostate angels are cast into hell, or the place of final punishment, if we may speak of *place* in this connexion, but only that they are confined, till they shall be brought to judgment, in a place of darkness, called Tartarus. By this, says Grotius, is meant the lower regions of the atmosphere near the earth, called obscure or shadowy, as may be gathered from Philo and Plutarch, in comparison with heaven, where is light superior to that of the sun and moon, pure, and unmingled with darkness. According to this opinion, the apostate spirits are supposed to have been thrust down from the upper heavens, the abode of purest light, into the nether atmosphere, far below the region of the stars, where they are confined, as in a prison, and beyond the limits of which they are not permitted to wander. Hence the expression, 'Prince of the power of the air.' Eph. ii. 2. Whatever weight be allowed to the criticism of Grotius, which is certainly ingenious, it is evident that the word in question is very inaccurately translated, 'cast down to hell.'

Dr Channing notices another instance of the error he is endeavouring to expose—the common apprehensions formed of heaven, and of the methods by which it may be obtained. Not a few, I suspect, conceive of heaven as a foreign good. It is a distant country, to which we are to be conveyed by an outward agency. How slowly do men learn, that heaven is the perfection of the mind, and that Christ gives it now just as far as he raises the mind to celestial truth and virtue.' The following are part of his concluding remarks.

'Look not abroad for the blessings of Christ. His reign and chief blessings are within you. The human soul is his kingdom. There he gains his victories, there rears his temples, there lavishes his treasures. His noblest monument is a mind, redeemed from iniquity, brought back and devoted to God, forming itself after the perfection of the Saviour, great

through its power to suffer for truth, lovely through its meek and gentle virtues. No other monument does Christ desire; for this will endure and increase in splendor, when earthly thrones shall have fallen, and even when the present order of the outward universe shall have accomplished its work, and shall have passed away.' pp. 21-2

36. Annotations on the New Testament. By J P. Dabney. Boston. 1828.

It has long been a matter of surprise to us, that a work precisely of this description has not been prepared and published by some gentleman of leisure, and competent learning. The complaint has grown quite common of late, that we want a family bible; but as this is an undertaking, which requires much time and labor, and besides must be very expensive, it was to be expected that it would be preceded by a publication like the present. The great object of a family bible, too, certainly *one* of the greatest, the explanation of scripture, may be effectually answered in a cheap and unpretending volume, like the one before us; which for this very reason may be put into the hands of readers generally, while the circulation of a larger and more expensive work must, as a natural consequence, be quite limited. We also have serious doubts about the propriety of spreading before the reader, on the same page, text, comment, and practical observations; as it may insensibly lead him, and we believe it often does in fact lead the unthinking, to attach to them all the same, or nearly the same authority. It would be amusing, if it were not for some of its moral influences, and its effect on the progress of truth, to see with what solemn assent many a pious and well meaning Christian reads the hasty and ill digested commentary of Scott, and takes it all for gospel, though it is perfectly understood, that no well informed critic of any denomination would give to that writer's opinions on such subjects the weight of a feather. We may mention another objection to family bibles; their assuming, as they seem to do, that, looking merely to its moral uses, we are to read the bible through in course, as if some parts, in a practical view, were not much more valuable than others, and should not be read oftener; or as if any good could come from ever reading before children and

young persons such a book as Solomon's Song; or from trying to spell out whole chapters of hard names in Numbers.

We will not say, all things considered, that a family bible is not desirable; but we shall probably have to wait several years before one is prepared, and in the mean time must avail ourselves of some such substitute as is offered in the compilation before us. One number, as a specimen of the work, has been some time before the public, and another much larger will soon follow, continuing the annotations through the rest of Matthew and Mark; most of which we have had an opportunity to examine. Considering this work as intended for common readers, and especially for teachers in Sunday Schools, several things may be noticed, which entitle it, as we conceive, to commendation, and ought to bring it into general use.

Probably no work of the kind now extant, comes so near as this will, as a whole, to exhibiting the sense of scripture held by the majority of Unitarians in this country. The notes are brief, and as few, as the objects of the work will possibly allow; in consequence of which, the whole will be comprised in a moderately sized duodecimo volume. The compiler shows none of the perverse ingenuity of those commentators who seem, next to the honor of removing an old difficulty, to reckon that of discovering a new one. He also avoids giving a multitude of interpretations to the same passage, of all which, excepting one or two, perhaps, the best that can be said is, that they are ingenious and plausible. In this way it would have been easy for him to make a parade of what is called learning; but its effect on common readers would have been to distract their minds, and introduce uncertainty; so that, where the book would have met and resolved one doubt, it would probably have suggested twenty. Besides, we believe that those commentators and compilers who are most officious in their endeavours to explain what is already sufficiently intelligible, commonly compensate themselves for this useless trouble, by skipping the really difficult passages. It should also be mentioned in praise of this work, that it is not controversial either in manner or spirit; for though the compiler gives what he conceives to be the best and truest comments on

difficult and disputed passages, he does not dwell on them, nor attach an undue importance to them, nor fall to abusing those who understand them differently. Finally, it will add to the value and authority of these Annotations, that the name of the author is given, we believe in every case, whom the compiler has quoted or followed; and perhaps we cannot better recommend the work than by saying, that of these names, none occur so frequently as those of Grotius, Le Clerc, Rosenmuller, Wakefield, and Priestley.

Some may object that these Annotations are not always so full and perspicuous that they will be readily comprehended by common readers, and perhaps they are not; and this may be owing in a few instances to an obscure and involved style, which might have been avoided without any sacrifice of brevity. It should be considered, however, that to make every part of scripture perfectly plain and simple to the unlearned, it would have been necessary for the compiler to insert, not short notes merely, but whole dissertations, and change essentially the character of the work. Many ministers, who are in the habit of lecturing on the scriptures, will probably recommend this work to their people, as a sort of textbook, and will be able to supply the deficiency here complained of, as occasion offers; and we can conceive of no other way in which it can be supplied, in all cases, without losing and sacrificing more than would be gained. It is easy to cavil at particular omissions or failures; after all, however, we suspect it will be difficult to refer to any work, which will give, even to common readers, and in the same compass, so much useful and agreeable information.

We hope Mr Dabney will go on and complete the volume without any unnecessary delays; and we are glad to learn that this is his object, and that he proposes to have the whole off his hands by the first of March. We hope, also, that he will give a preface to the Annotations, containing brief historical notices of the several books of the New Testament, and something which may serve as a key, particularly to the Epistles. It would not swell the volume much, it would greatly enhance its value, and the labor it would require would be inconsiderable.

37. *A Discourse on the reciprocal Duties of a Minister and his People*; delivered at the Opening of the Christian Chapel in Salem, Mass. May 1, 1828. By Charles Morgridge, Minister of the First Christian Society in New Bedford. Boston: Wait, Greene, & Co. 1828. 12mo. pp. 24.

THIS is a well written, and somewhat original performance. In old times, the pastoral care used to be almost the only subject chosen by preachers at dedications and ordinations; of course it became a little the worse for so constant wear. But lately, such an abundant variety of topics has been discussed on those occasions, that the pastoral care comes before us with an aspect approaching to novelty. In any times, however, this sermon must have been listened to with interest, and been deemed creditable to the understanding, piety, taste, and heart of the writer. We regard it with additional pleasure, as the work of a gentleman who stands high among the ministers of that denomination of Christians called *Christianian*, which we have been for some time in the habit of considering as a remarkable and effectual instrument in diffusing widely abroad through our population, correct, generous, and scriptural views of christian theology; a denomination in which are united simplicity with good sense, and a deep and zealous piety with rational opinions.

There are some instances in this sermon of a quaintness, which reminds us of the old English writers. Advising a minister of the gospel to let mystery alone, and preach plainly and directly from the bible, Mr Morgridge says, 'He will thereby avoid the criminality of darkening counsel by words without knowledge. He will also avail himself of the singular advantage of preaching to all who believe the scriptures, without giving needless offence to any; while every devout hearer, being free from disquieting apprehensions of *having his ear cut off by the sword of sectarianism*, cannot fail to receive instruction, and comfort, and blessing under such a ministry.'

A curious legend is introduced towards the end of the discourse, to illustrate the position, that in doing his people service the minister increases the difficulty of his own salvation. From what author or book it is taken, we confess that we do not know; but it is as follows;—

'Coivin, now with God and his angels, had

a vision to this purpose, on the day of his consecration to the ministry. Awful thoughts filled his soul. A heavenly light shone in his cell. He turned his eye to the heavens, and, lo! they were illuminated; he looked to the earth, and, lo! it was on fire. The judgment throne was set, and the inhabitants of heaven and earth assembled. Michael stood forth before the judge, and held in his hand that mighty balance in which souls and their actions are weighed. When ordinary mortals were put into the scales, the standard by which they were tried was less and lighter; nor did they seem to be too scrupulously weighed, if the beam stood only near a poise. Nay, the breath of mercy made it sometimes incline in their favor, when all the pleas that made for them could not decidedly cast it. But when ministers came to be weighed, the standard was ten times augmented, for those of whom least was required; and, in general, that by which they were tried was the weight of the angel Ithiel, prince of the seventh or lowest order of the hierarchy of heaven. For God had ordained, that in the progressive scale there should be no blank, and that the highest order of men should reach the lowest order of superior beings. Coivin reflected on the dread office to which he was set apart; he perceived the awful sanctity and care which it required. His heart swelled; the tears burst from his eyes; he wiped them with his hand and the vision vanished. The impression, however, remained, and Coivin lived on earth, innocent, and active, as an angel of heaven.'—p. 21.

To this vision is immediately subjoined by the preacher, with great simplicity, '*Thus you see, brethren, that the salvation of your minister is, by the nature of his office, rendered far more difficult than if he sustained a private relation.*'

38. *An Address, delivered at Springfield, before the Hampden Colonization Society. July 4th, 1828. By William B. O. Peabody.*—Springfield, S. Bowles. 1828. 8vo. pp. 16.

WE fear that the national character is more likely to be debased than elevated, by the manner in which the anniversary of our Independence is commonly celebrated. We do not now refer to the dissipation and excess which often attend it, but to the addresses and orations, written for the most part by young men without maturity of mind, or discretion, and wholly for popular effect. It is something that the public taste should be depraved by these puerile and inflated compositions; but this is an evil which dwindles into insignificance compared with their moral and political influences. The day had better not be remembered at all than be remembered merely to exasperate and inflame party spirit; or to keep alive antipathies against the mother country, which every good man must wish to

see buried; or to feed a national vanity, at the same time one of the most enfeebling and one of the most contemptible of passions.

We are delighted when we meet with a striking exception to these remarks, as in this Address of Mr Peabody, written in the peculiar and beautiful style for which the author is justly distinguished, and on a subject, and in a spirit, so appropriate to the occasion. His object is to explain the reason of the imperfect influence of Christianity on the public relations of men, considered with a particular reference to slavery and war.

'I may as well say in the beginning, that I am speaking simply of the relation of slavery and the practice of war. I am not complaining of the owners of slaves; they cannot get rid of them; it would be as humane to throw them from the decks in the middle passage as to set them free in our country. Neither do I condemn defensive war; it rests upon the rights of self-defence, which individuals possess, and may delegate to governments if they will. I have no taste for sweeping condemnation. I can sympathize with the owners of slaves, and admire the patriotic defenders of their country, while I detest war and slavery with all my heart.' p. 3-4

Five reasons are assigned for the imperfect influence of Christianity in correcting these evils, on each of which the writer insists at some length, and often eloquently. 1. Men regard the letter more than the spirit of religion. 2. It requires great christian principle to make men abandon vices, though it requires very little to make men disapprove them. 3. We consider the point as gained already. 4. Men have applied a different morality to public and private affairs. 5. No community, no nation can properly be said to be christian, in the highest and best sense of that word.

This is the outline, and our limits will permit us to give but a single specimen of the manner in which the author fills it up.

'We think that the public feeling is sufficiently alive to the criminality of slavery and war, and that no exertions are necessary to add to the prevailing conviction of their guilt. I must say that we take praise to ourselves too soon. Christianity can do but little to reform the world, if men are so easily satisfied with their success. I look in vain for the proofs of this general condemnation of these gigantic sins. I see on the contrary a lofty and enthusiastic interest everywhere excited by deeds of battle and blood. I see the guilty paths of great destroyers, traced upon the map with breathless emotion; I see the finest productions of earthly inspiration growing out of this corruption, like wild flowers from the heaps where the bodies

of the slain decay, and the warmest reverence the world can give, lavished on those, who trample most widely and carelessly on the rights and feelings of men. We may say that we admire not the destruction nor the guilt; not the field shaken with artillery and slippery with blood, but the great intellectual energy displayed in guiding the vast masses of human power; this will not do; for great energy should be detested for its alliance with crime, rather than crime be forgiven because united with energy. The public religious feeling must be pronounced unsound, so long as men can admire these splendid sins; and it is absolutely impossible for one who worships these destroyers, to have any real reverence for the gentle greatness of the Son of God.' p. 7-8.

39. Religious Discourses. By a Layman. Philadelphia, Carey, Lea & Carey. 1828. 12mo. pp. 79.

It is well known that this 'Layman' is Sir Walter Scott. The English publisher, who is the gentleman for whom the discourses were written, calls them 'remarkable productions of their illustrious author's mind.' Remarkable they certainly are, in several respects. They are remarkable for their singular, and if we have been rightly informed, not exceedingly creditable history; and they are remarkable for not showing a single spark of their author's extraordinary genius, which glows and burns so brightly on every page of his other writings, that we may well call that work of his remarkable which reflects not a solitary glimmer. There are a hundred better sermons, of a page, two pages, or half a page in length, in Sir Walter's glorious novels, each of which sermons contains more eloquence and better divinity than the seventynine pages of these discourses put together.

There are two ways in which we would account for this phenomenon. One is, that the author, as soon as he found himself writing a sermon, caught an infectious dullness from his employment, which even his spirit could not overcome, and a strain of high Orthodoxy, which had always been associated in his mind with pulpit performances; and the other is, that he endeavoured, from motives of policy, and a regard for his young friend, to be as dull as he could, in which attempt he has wonderfully succeeded. Private anecdote informs us, how truly we know not, though the preface remarkably corroborates the story, that Sir Walter was, some time ago, applied to by a 'young friend' to

compose two sermons, the one doctrinal, the other practical, which might be presented by that friend, *as his own*, to some body of men before whom he was to be examined as a theological candidate. Sir Walter consented, and in one afternoon, or some such period, produced the discourses which are now given to the public; thus goodnaturedly enough condescending to become *grinder*, we believe they call it thus, to his 'young friend.' It is added, that when some one inquired of the baronet whether he was not afraid of send-

ing his friend before the examiners with sermons which he had struck off in so short a time, he answered, that 'he must be a poor stick if he could not satisfy the baillies o' Edinbro!' If this story is true, let the discourses pass as remarkable productions of *grinding*, and so far forth, of their illustrious author's mind. We should like to know moreover, now the discourses are published, how the 'young friend' gets along with 'the baillies o' Edinboro'. We do not understand these things in the new world.

INTELLIGENCE.

Correspondence of the American Unitarian Association, on the State of Unitarian Christianity.—[In May last the Secretary of the Amer. Unit. Assoc. addressed a series of questions to Unitarian clergymen and other gentlemen of high standing in different sections of the country, intended to elicit information on the state and prospects of Unitarianism. The Orthodox periodicals had represented the late extraordinary efforts to get up Orthodox revivals, &c. as having resulted, or as fast resulting in the extinction of the 'Arian and Socinian heresies' so called, especially in Massachusetts where the most strenuous exertions have been made to that effect. From the mass of letters received in reply, all of which are of the most encouraging character, we have been permitted to publish as many as our limits will allow, and we now present our readers with a number from various parts of Massachusetts, which are given without selection, and which may hereafter be followed by others from this and other States of the Union.]

FRANKLIN COUNTY.

'On the question relating to the progress of Unitarian Christianity, I can hardly hope to be considered an impartial judge. I will, however, confine myself chiefly to facts, and will endeavour to state them as correctly as I can. My remarks will be confined mostly to this county. In my own society, nothing to my knowledge, has been attempted to alienate the mind from liberal views of the gospel; nor do I apprehend, that such an attempt

would meet with any success. Though this society is small, containing probably not more than a fifth or sixth of the inhabitants of the town, yet those who are well acquainted with the state of things here, have repeatedly told me, that they believe one half at least of the people are charitably liberal in their opinions and feelings. Many of this class belong to the Episcopal Society, which they had joined before ours was formed; and others, from local, or other prejudices, are induced to remain where they are. The prospects of our society have never been better, I think, than at present. In some towns in this vicinity, there is little or no advance in the truth; the people remain very much under the influence of the Calvinistic clergy, and have scarcely any opportunity to become enlightened. But in many other towns the progress of Unitarianism is far more rapid, than could have been expected. Within a few years three Orthodox societies have been formed in this county, in towns where there were none before; viz. in N——, S——, N——, and B——, ston. They are all feeble; and that in the last named town does not contain more than eight or ten families. The two former have ministers supported in part by the Domestic Missionary Society. So far as I know, this is all that can be said of the progress of Orthodoxy in this county. On the other hand, in many towns, where it formerly held exclusive sway, Unitarian societies, embracing a respectable portion of the population, have been formed, within a few years. This is true of M——,

and L—— on the east side of the river, and G——, G——, C——, H——, S——, and C——, on the west. I omit D——, because the change there is of longer standing; but what took place there twenty years ago did not a little toward leading the people in this vicinity to think for themselves. I will state a few particulars respecting some of the towns which I have mentioned. In M——, two years ago, the town was chiefly in one society, having an Orthodox minister, Mr G——. He is now dismissed; and at least one half of those, who formerly belonged to his society, now constitute a Unitarian society. In S——, within a few weeks, a Unitarian society has been formed, containing from thirty to forty voters, and a good portion of the wealth, intelligence, and influence of the town. The state of things in C—— is not less favorable. In H—— the number of Unitarians is increasing every year. In each of these places, it is desirable, that a Unitarian minister should be settled. But such ministers are not to be found in sufficient numbers to satisfy these wants. In C——, where till lately, the Orthodox have held undivided possession, a majority of the people now belong to the Liberal society. Were I to go into Hampshire County, I could give you a favorable account of P——, G——, W——, B——, W——, &c. but for information of the state of things there I would refer you to Mr H——, of N——. In our region, I think, there is a general spirit of inquiry as to religious subjects, and a visible improvement of morals. The tone of feeling is becoming more liberal and elevated, and there is an increasing disposition to place religion in a good life, rather than in particular creeds, and occasional excitements. There are exceptions to this remark, and the most of them would probably be found in the most rigid of the Orthodox churches, where creeds and experiences are used as tests of character. If any means could be adopted to send a missionary into this county, a young man, who would devote his whole time to preaching and visiting, in the towns which I have mentioned, he would do great service to the cause of pure Christianity.

BRISTOL COUNTY.

Your questions may, I think, be best

answered by adverting, first, to the fact that, during the ministry of my predecessor, the great subjects of controversy, which were much agitated in many other parts of the country, were not brought distinctly before the minds of the people here, and of course did not excite a general interest. It was known that Mr P—— was not a Calvinist, but his parishioners generally did not suppose that he differed in other respects from ministers who are now called Orthodox. A few years, however, before his decease, he discontinued the use of Watts's doxologies; and his so doing occasioned for a time much unchristian excitement. I commenced preaching here in April 1821. In the mean time a hue and cry was raised by the Calvinists of this vicinity about the terrible Unitarian heresy, and great efforts were made to prevent the settlement of a Unitarian minister. They succeeded in exciting the fears and strengthening the prejudices of many who then heard of Unitarianism for the first time, or who were already deeply imbued with another doctrine, so that soon after my ordination, about sixteen seceded from my society. Such was the origin of the Orthodox society in this village. From that time the Orthodox in this vicinity have been unwearied in their efforts to stop the progress of Liberal Christianity. How far they have succeeded I will give you the best means I have of judging.—As to the course which I have pursued, my people can bear witness that it has been plain and unequivocal. I have not suffered them to be in any doubt as to what I have thought of the leading doctrines of Orthodoxy. It has been my constant object to establish my people in the belief and practice of pure Unitarian Christianity—the ‘truth as it is in Jesus.’ They can now, I thank God, bear the light and do rejoice in it. I can confidently say that there has been a great improvement in the moral and religious character of the people here within the last seven years. Formerly there was but one house for public worship in the village—now there are three; one of which was not long since built by the Baptists and the other by Mr M——’s society. Formerly not more than one half of the pews in the meetinghouse of the First Congregational Society were usually occupied. Now they are commonly filled with attentive hearers, and for the two last years applications have been

frequently made for pews and seats, which could not be obtained. Formerly the sabbath was devoted to dissipation of various kinds, as I am credibly informed, by at least as large a number of people as usually attended public worship. Now the sabbath is about as well observed here as in any town in the State of as great a population. The large number of foreigners, who, in the course of the last three years, have been employed in the manufacturing establishments here, have not produced so bad an effect upon the morals of the place as might have been and indeed was expected. So much concerning things in general. Now I will say something more about my own society in particular.

'The next fall after my ordination the church at my request laid aside the old creed and covenant or confession of faith, which was used during Mr P——'s ministry in admitting members to communion, and adopted one simply requiring the candidate to receive the scriptures as a sufficient rule of faith and conduct. In 1824 I persuaded my people, who had always used Watts's Psalms and Hymns, to give them up for the New York Collection. I was much gratified that the change soon became universally satisfactory. I have already said that our meetinghouse is commonly filled—the pews and galleries occupied. My congregation has increased in number every year. It never was at any former period so numerous as it has been for the last twelve months, and, what is worthy of notice, this accession of numbers and strength is of a substantial kind—not made up of the floating population of the village and neighbourhood, but embracing principally men permanently and prosperously settled in business. You will undoubtedly be pleased to learn that my society have lately voted to build, in the course of the present season, a large and permanent meetinghouse of stone or brick, at the cost of not less than sixteen thousand dollars. Our present house was built only thirtysix years ago, and is about as large as any in this part of the country, but is not large enough to accommodate all who wish to connect themselves with our society. I am not sure, however, that such a project would have been started at this time had not Orthodox zeal attempted to revive &c. * * * * You wish to know how far the

people of this vicinity are willing "to countenance attempts to restrain free inquiry and undermine religious liberty." Those who are at all aware that such attempts are making, contemplate them with strong feelings of indignation. In no part of the country are the people more attached to religious liberty; and though they are generally friendly to free inquiry, yet there is less of its spirit here than in some other parts of the State; that is, the people generally read less. But in this respect there is an evident improvement taking place. Pains have been taken to circulate Unitarian books and tracts, and the effect has been to excite the spirit of inquiry and to establish the minds of many in right general notions of the gospel. A "Society for promoting Christian Knowledge," embracing many of the most intelligent and active of my parishioners and a few gentlemen of the neighbouring town of R——, has been very useful. The books purchased by the funds of this society are read by all who are willing to read them, and when read are returned to me as librarian. I endeavour to keep them in use. The juvenile library also, which is connected with our Sunday school, does much good, by giving the children a taste for reading, and by promoting their orderly behaviour, especially on the sabbath. On the whole it is evident to my mind that the knowledge and virtue of this part of the country are increasing, and consequently that the people are becoming more and more unfit to be the abject slaves or the humble servants of spiritual tyrants.

'I fear I have already trespassed too far on your patience. But as the Orthodox have boasted much of their success in building up the Trinitarian society in this village, I should like to tell you *how* they effected it—how they pulled down Mr C——'s society in doing it, by drawing away a large part of his hearers—how those who remained with him, aided by a small fund, removed their meetinghouse about two miles from their former place of worship into the neighbourhood of a cotton factory to find a congregation, &c. &c.'

ESSEX COUNTY.

'As to the state of Unitarian Christianity in this quarter, it is highly encouraging to its friends. In my own parish it has never had more nor warmer advocates. It is now more than seven-

teen years since my connexion with this people. During the whole of this period we have known how good a thing it is for brethren to dwell together in unity. Attempts have often been made by the members of the Theological Seminary in this town, and by the Orthodox clergy of neighbouring parishes, to disturb and scatter this parish; but thanks to the great Head of it, without effect. Nearly every year of my ministry has given evidence of its salutary influence in the growing numbers of my church, and in the improving character of the people at large. But in no single year has this evidence been so abundant as in the last. The better rational views of Christianity are understood by my people, the stronger is their hold on their affections and confidence, and the more cheerful they become to make an effort to defend and propagate them. Nor is this feeling and disposition confined to my own parish. The Exclusive System kept up by the Orthodox clergy in this neighbourhood, has roused the righteous indignation of their people and made them tremble. Within one year this system has led to the removal of two ministers in the town of H—. In the west parish the society are earnestly seeking a Unitarian preacher. And in the village an Orthodox man is settled with an understanding that his continuance depends on the liberality of his exchanges. In B—, B—, R—, and T—, numbers of the most influential people have withdrawn their support from Orthodoxy and are supporting Unitarian worship; and in all those places it is believed the Orthodox ministers stand on slippery ground. At L—, they have exchanged an Exclusive man, and the upper parish in B— are on the verge of doing the same. In the south parish in this town, lately under the care of Dr E—, nine tenths of the inhabitants are firm friends of toleration. And what is more, a respectable number of them are decided Unitarians. These facts speak loud, and whatever may be the condition of Unitarian Christianity elsewhere, I am confident it has no cause for despondency here, but in the imperfections of its professors and friends. It is true the Orthodox are on the alert, and if confidence and boasting and revival making will give them success, they *may* carry all before them. The business of 'getting up revivals' seems to be their last resort in an ex-

piring cause. Whenever I hear of an extraordinary attempt at one, I conclude the minister feels his hold on his parish giving way. 'The children of this world are in their generation wiser than the children of light.' Let Unitarians make an effort of half the magnitude of their opponents, and their cause is safe. God will bless his truth. It must triumph.'

ESSEX COUNTY, (*south eastern part.*)

'Unitarianism, considered as an appellation distinguishing all those Christians who dissent from Trinitarian and Calvinistic views, is spreading gradually in this place. The change which has taken place in the religious sentiments of many of the inhabitants of this town, within the last sixteen years, is great. When I was settled in the ministry, the whole of my parish were Trinitarian in their views, and a large portion of them Calvinistic; and although I explicitly declared to them, prior to my settlement, my own opinions, still they unanimously persisted in inviting me to take the pastoral care of them. For two or three years, peculiarities of religious opinions attracted but little attention; but when the public mind became excited, and directed to these subjects, then my own opinions were vehemently attacked by some of my own parish; gross misrepresentations of them were made, and the most unfair and unchristian means were resorted to to render my instructions and myself suspicious. This conduct awakened the attention of my people to the religious points in dispute: and the unfair and evidently unjust methods employed by the disaffected, led the honest part of the parish, and the serious of other societies, to examine their own opinions, to compare them with the sacred scriptures, to scrutinize closely those which I entertained, and the reasons advanced in support of them. The result was, that more than two thirds of my parish at once became rationally and decidedly Unitarian and Anticalvinistic in their opinions. The number of this description has gradually increased, so that at present, very few, if any, are found in my parish, which is a very large one, who are in reality Trinitarian, or Calvinistic. Some few indeed, aged persons, retain the language, the phrases &c. of Orthodoxy; but they in fact have nothing of it in their opinions, nor in their temper.

'In the society under the pastoral care of Mr D——, very many of the most respectable proprietors are decidedly Anticalvinistic, but remain there, as we think they ought to and as we wish, to aid in the support of stated religious instruction. You will remember, that the zealous Mr. —— is of that society, whose name is found in most of the Orthodox periodicals. His influence and efforts, however, do not, in my opinion, add any to his party. On the whole, it is fully my conviction, that what I consider liberal and just views of Christianity, are prevailing here.'

PLYMOUTH COUNTY.

'The cause of Unitarian Christianity, notwithstanding the boasting of the Orthodox, I am confident, is not losing, but gaining ground in this town and vicinity. I will mention a few facts and circumstances, which authorize me to express this opinion. My own church has been better filled, and the number much larger, during the last year and present, than for any period for five years previous. And the parish clerk informs me, that not an individual has 'signed off,' as they term it, for two years, to any other society, but several have joined us from the Orthodox, and others, it is known, intend doing it soon. It is the general opinion of the most intelligent gentlemen in the society, that it is improving in numbers and property. The spirit of free inquiry is among us. Without any solicitation, I may say, I have thirty subscribers in my society for the Liberal Preacher; and chiefly those who are not subscribers to the tracts of the Amer. Unita. Asso. New subscribers are added almost every week. So far as I have the means of judging, I am persuaded there never was more freedom of inquiry, and never more interest felt and expressed in the progress and success of Unitarianism, or Rational Christianity, than at this time; and my belief is, that any open attempt to stop its progress, would prove more injurious to the Orthodox societies than to the Liberal. The general opinion is, that the Calvinistic Baptist society and the other Orthodox society have lost ground within the last two years.

'I am not very intimately acquainted with the state of religion in the neighbouring towns. In W——, however, the minister who was Orthodox, is dismissed and gone, and, as a society,

they are evidently Liberal. I preached there lately to a very respectable assembly, and a very attentive audience, although on the same day a meeting was held at a private house by the Orthodox. The society, three to one, I was told, are advocates for Liberal Christianity, and this town has always been under the yoke of the Orthodox. Five years ago the council that ordained the late minister, voted Mr G—— and his church out of the council, on the ground that he was not the pastor of any church. The present condition of this society is the result of this outrage.

'On the whole, I place no confidence in the reports of the Orthodox periodicals on the state of religion, or the progress and triumphs of Orthodoxy. They are not true; they are exaggerated, highly colored, and in many instances absolutely false. It is painful to read them, for they are not to be believed. We have only to regret that men, who would be thought to embrace and teach all that is true and good in Christianity, should pay so little regard to truth and goodness in maintaining their cause.'

BRISTOL COUNTY.

'The truth is, that the revival seasons of the last two years have been utterly defeated of their object so far as Unitarians are concerned. It was confidently expected that this blast would tear us to pieces. The storm has gone by, and we all stand firm.

'Nothing could be more true than all this with regard to *ourselves*. Our society has regularly increased, and the Orthodox have not gained from us a single member, of any description.

'Things are more promising in this neighbourhood. A strong demonstration has been made in favor of Liberal principles in W——, eighteen miles east of us. It appears that half of the town is Liberal, and the Calvinistic clergyman is dismissed. Whether they will be able to support a Unitarian minister, is doubtful. I am surprised to find that Liberal thinkers are springing up in other towns around us.'

WORCESTER COUNTY.

'In answer to your questions, I will endeavour to state my impression, and give you such facts as come within my knowledge. I think the people are inquiring, and are taking a more decided ground—and this is altogether

favorable to our cause. Our own parish has grown since the last year. Several respectable families have been added. Our meeting is far better filled than it was a year ago. We have commenced a new house, for it is impossible to procure seats for all who would worship with us. We have added nearly twenty to our church, and a spirit of inquiry and of religious earnestness prevails among our people. Although there has been an excitement among the Orthodox, we have lost none. In the aspect of things in our neighbourhood, we have everything to encourage us. In L—— an Auxiliary to the American Unitarian Assoc. has been formed. B—— has formed a new Unitarian parish. G——, R——, and O——, are discontented with the present state of things, and I may say generally, in the county, the people are for putting the question to their ministers, whether they mean to be Exclusive or not. I do not hesitate to say that it is my firm belief that the aspect of things is far more favorable than it was a year ago.'

HAMPSHIRE COUNTY.

'To your circular, asking for information, I have not much to say that I have not said before. Things remain much as in the fall—better in some places, worse in *none*. The aspect of affairs is certainly encouraging. I have not heard of anything to dishearten in the least—not a single instance of backsliding or conversion from Unitarianism to Orthodoxy, or anything of the kind—but much implying an opposite progress.'

Unitarian Ministers.—[There is no want which the Unitarian denomination at the present moment feels more sensibly than that of an increased number of Unitarian ministers. Any hints as to the best manner in which this want may be supplied, are therefore seasonable and valuable. It is for this reason and not because we are prepared to advocate in their full extent the measures it proposes, that we publish the following extract from a letter addressed to the Secretary of the Am. Unit. Assoc. by a highly respectable clergyman of Pennsylvania, who has had particularly favorable opportunities for judging to what extent the remark we began with is true.]

'I have just read, with much interest, the account of the Theological School

at Cambridge, in the *Christian Examiner* for March and April, 1827. I have heard from other sources of information that the demand for Unitarian ministers is greater than that School can at present supply. It is therefore highly desirable and necessary, that some new method should be adopted for sending a greater number of young men into the ministry, that we may be able to supply the increased and increasing demand for pastors and teachers. Will you pardon me, if I venture to suggest a plan, which I think might easily be carried into execution, and which would be productive of immense advantage to the Unitarian cause.

'I have understood that it is an indispensable prerequisite for admission into the Theological School, that young men should be pretty well advanced in the knowledge of the Latin and Greek languages, and in some branches of general science. This arrangement necessarily excludes a number of worthy and excellent young men, who, having arrived at mature age before they were convinced of the truth and value of our doctrines, and having only an English education, are at once deterred from devoting themselves to the ministry, from the long preparation that would be necessary before they could be admitted into the Theological School at Cambridge. Hence the idea of becoming useful as ministers of the gospel, is at once abandoned, and their otherwise useful talents are devoted to other pursuits. What I wish to propose to your serious consideration, as a remedy for this want, is, that an attempt should be made to open the Theological School at Cambridge, for the reception of young men of pious character and good natural talents, though destitute of all classical knowledge; that these should remain two or three years in the School; that theology, in an especial manner, should be an object of their study, in conjunction with all those branches of knowledge, which are immediately connected with this subject; that they should be taught composition, particularly in relation to sermonizing; that they should be initiated into the practice of extemporary preaching, which is a most important and valuable part of the theological course at Cambridge; and, in a word, that they should be taught every branch of knowledge, which can be acquired without an acquaintance with the Latin and Greek languages.

'I can easily foresee that some objections may be made to this proposal; but I am fully satisfied they will be of small moment, when compared with the immense advantages which would arise from its introduction. Some years ago the importance of such an object as this, was so much felt in England by the zealous friends of the Unitarian cause, that an institution of this kind was established at Hackney, under the superintendence of the truly pious and zealous Mr Aspland; from which several useful ministers have been sent out, who are now laboring in various parts of England. Let me therefore beg that you will give this subject an attentive consideration; and if it should meet your approbation, as I hope and trust it will, that you will introduce it to some of your zealous and active friends. It is not necessary that every minister should be a classical scholar. If one in ten of our ministers are deeply learned, it will be sufficient for the honor and success of our cause. Let such be established in our cities and large towns, where their learned and polished discourses will attract the attention of cultivated minds. But in the country, in nine cases out of ten, ministers educated as I propose, will be equally, if not more useful, than the elegant and polite scholar, and it is in the country where the want of ministers is most sensibly felt. In our large towns, where large salaries can be given, and polished society can be found, there will be little difficulty in obtaining ministers. But in the country, which will generally be deficient in both these respects, the difficulty will be great, unless we educate a class of men, whose habits and attainments are adapted to the circle in which they are destined to move. If this plan were introduced, we should in all probability have three students where we have now one: and thus would be brought into immediate operation, the collective talent of the Unitarian body.'

Theological School in Cambridge.—The Annual Visitation of this School, took place on Friday, July 11. The exercises by the students were as follows;—

MIDDLE CLASS.

1. On the Proper Test of Ministerial Faithfulness. *George Whitney.*
2. On Religious Controversy. *Cazneau Palfrey.*

3. The Progress of Religious Truth. *William Newell.*
4. The Effect of Free Inquiry on the Influence of the Clergy. *Hersey B. Goodwin.*
5. An Exposition of John xi. 35.—'Jesus wept.' *William Barry, Jr.*
6. An Exposition of Luke xx. 19—26. *Stephen A. Barnard.*
7. On Religious Poetry. *David H. Barlow.*
8. On the Causes of Infidelity. *Horatio Alger.*

SENIOR CLASS.

1. The Encouragements which this Country affords to a Faithful Ministry. *Moses G. Thomas.*
2. Pastoral Duties. *John L. Sibley.*
3. On the Leading Design of the Christian Ministry. *Artemas B. Muzzey.*
4. Should the Connexion between a Pastor and People be Permanent? *Samuel K. Lothrop.*
5. The Influence of Christianity on the World. *Frederick H. Hedge.*
6. On the Differences in Religious Opinions among Christians. *Jonathan Cole.*
7. On the Study of Ecclesiastical History. *George P. Bradford.*

Unitarian Mission in Bengal.—[In our number for July and August, 1826, we published at length a letter from the Rev. Mr Adam, of Calcutta, giving an account of 'the principal facts, and circumstances connected with the present state and prospects of Unitarian Christianity in British India.' That letter, it seems, has also been published in Calcutta, and is the 'Brief Memoir' referred to below. At the General Meeting of the friends and supporters of Unitarian Christianity in Calcutta, of which we gave an account in our last number, the 'Unitarian Committee' of that city, read a report, which has since been given to the public under the title of the 'Second Memoir Respecting the Unitarian Mission in Bengal, &c.' We shall copy the whole of it into our pages, as the best means of putting our readers in possession of the most authentic information upon the interesting subject to which it relates. It occupies thirty six duodecimo pages, and we in this number present to our readers about two thirds of it, and we shall feel happy if it should succeed in attracting to the mission an attention better proportioned to its importance than any it has hitherto received.]

‘Two years have elapsed since the publication of the “Brief Memoir respecting the Establishment of a Unitarian Mission in Bengal,” which contained the first announcement made to the Indian Public that such an object was contemplated and that measures were in progress for its accomplishment. A Unitarian Mission had not then been established in Bengal, but it has since gone into operation, and its friends in India, in England, and in America, expect more information than they have yet received respecting what has been done, what is now doing, and what is proposed to be done for the promotion of its objects. The Calcutta Unitarian Committee which has been chiefly instrumental in calling the attention of Unitarians to the subject of a Foreign Mission, and which can alone be employed in this country in directing its operations and superintending its details, as the proper organ for communicating the information required, present the following Report.

‘1. *Cooperation of Foreign Unitarians.*—The Committee, at their institution in 1821, deemed it their first duty to endeavour to secure *foreign aid*, convinced that such cooperation was necessary to the permanent prosperity of a Unitarian Mission in India. All other Protestant Missions derive the chief part of their resources from abroad, and all religious and philanthropic institutions, except Missionary ones and those patronized by the Government, are found to languish for want of support—an effect which arises from the comparatively small number of Europeans resident in India, and the constant fluctuations of English society; and which would be felt in a still higher degree in the case of a Unitarian Mission not enjoying foreign support, in consequence of the still smaller number of Unitarians, their liability to the same fluctuations, and the total want of sympathy with them among the professors of other christian denominations. The committee therefore lost no time in opening a correspondence with the English and American Unitarians with a view to secure their assistance in the establishment of a Unitarian Mission in Bengal, and thus to give full efficiency to their own exertions for that purpose, and they are happy to announce that they have in some degree succeeded, although after a greater delay than was originally anticipated.

‘Various considerations have prevent-

ed Foreign Unitarians from engaging with the desired promptitude in a Mission to this country, among which the following, collected from the writings both of English and American Unitarians, may be briefly enumerated:—They regard the christian religion as the most powerful instrument that can be employed for promoting human virtue and happiness; but they do not consider the knowledge of it indispensably necessary to salvation; they do not believe that all those who are ignorant of it are doomed to certain and eternal condemnation, and they are thus deprived of that paramount motive which has brought other Protestant denominations within the last thirty years into the field of Foreign Missions. Unitarians have also been discouraged by the injudicious manner in which, as appears to them, Trinitarian Missions have been conducted, by the little success attending them, and by the knowledge that Unitarian Missionaries would not be received as coadjutors, but opposed as enemies. Their numbers and resources also are comparatively limited, although rapidly on the increase; they have to contend for the first rights of Protestants and of citizens against the declared and unqualified hostility of all other christian sects; and they are consequently as yet able to apply only a small portion of their means to foreign objects, after affording due support to their domestic institutions. To these considerations it may be added that some of the gentlemen to whom letters were addressed from this country, have labored under severe and continued illness occasioning unavoidable delay; and the Committee deeply regret to state as a further obstacle to the success of their endeavours, the fact of calumnious statements respecting the personal conduct and character of some of their own body having been propagated from this country by certain individuals both in England and America, which, before there was sufficient time to contradict and refute them, had contributed to cool the zeal and paralyze the exertions of the well disposed.

‘For these various reasons the first communications of the Committee to the English and American Unitarians received but little attention. The first symptom of interest was discovered in a series of questions addressed by Professor Ware of Harvard University, United

States, on behalf of a number of Unitarian Christians with whom he was associated, to some of the members of the Committee, the answers to which, embodying all the information which could be obtained respecting the actual state of Protestant Missions in Bengal, were published, first in Calcutta, and afterwards at Boston, in America, where they excited very general attention to the subject which they treated. This was followed by a donation, from several individuals whose names were not given, of \$375 towards the support of a Missionary, but which was placed at the disposal of the Committee for the General Purposes of the Mission; and by a further donation of \$100 from the 'Association for aiding Religious Charities in Brattle Square Church,' Boston, which was added to the Chapel Fund. In February 1825, an Association was formed in Boston 'with a view to obtain and diffuse information respecting the state of religion in India, and to devise and recommend means for the promotion of Christianity in that part of the world,' of which Professor Ware was President, the Rev. Dr Tuckerman, Secretary, and Mr Lewis Tappan, Treasurer; and the first act of this Association was to remit six hundred dollars as their first annual contribution in aid of the funds for the support of a Missionary, with an engagement to continue it for three years certain. The sum thus received was also placed at the disposal of the Committee. In the course of the year 1826 various public meetings were held in Boston and numerous attended, the result of which was, instead of the Association just mentioned for obtaining *information*, the substitution of a 'Society for the Promotion of Christianity in India,' and a further remittance from that Society of 600 dollars towards the support of a Missionary, with a pledge to remit an equal sum annually for ten years, and the expression of a strong hope of being able to continue this contribution indefinitely. There has also been formed at Boston an 'American Unitarian Association' the object of which is to give union and efficiency to the whole Unitarian body in that country; and although it does not embrace foreign objects within its design, it seeks to maintain a friendly correspondence with this Committee, and has published two tracts powerfully recommending the cause of Foreign Missions to the support of American Unitarians.

This cause is advocated in America by several of the most distinguished Unitarians—clergymen, professors, merchants, &c. It has frequently been introduced into the pulpit and is made the subject of investigation at the Associations of Ministers. Its claims are defended in the periodical publications of the denomination, and it has been made the theme of College exercises. It is the frequent subject of private as well as of public discussion, and although not an object of universal support, yet it is one of general and extending interest, among Unitarian Christians in America.

For several years before the existence of this Committee, the English Unitarians had their attention called to British India by the exertions of Mr William Roberts at Madras. But the interest excited in favor of a Foreign Mission, was apparently limited and feeble; and the correspondence of this Committee did not produce any better effect until the publication in England at the expense of the London Unitarian Fund, of the answers to Professor Ware's questions, of which an edition was distributed gratis among Unitarian Ministers throughout England. In the early part of the year 1825, J. R. Freme, Esq. of Liverpool, remitted £35 as a donation towards the support of a Missionary from several friends at Liverpool and Manchester, of which £20 was added to the Chapel Fund, and £15 to the Fund for General Purposes; and about the same time a public subscription in aid of the Calcutta Mission was opened in England which ultimately amounted to £1579 2 2. In May, 1825, the British and Foreign Unitarian Association was formed, of which the promotion of Foreign Missions is one of the specific objects, there being a Foreign Secretary appointed to conduct the correspondence and manage the details belonging to that department. One of the first acts of this Association was a pledge to contribute 100 Rupees per month towards the support of a Unitarian Missionary for five years certain, with instructions to draw on their Treasurer for £100, which however it was not deemed advisable to do. In January, 1821, a remittance was received of £100 for General Purposes and of £15 towards the support of a Missionary, which was also added to the General Fund; and in May last the whole of the funds collected in England were received, amounting, with interest, to Sa. Rs. 17,091 9 8, of which

Sa. Rs. 1500 were for the support of a Missionary, Sa. Rs. 1562 1 8 in aid of the contingent expenses of the Mission, and the remainder towards the erection of the Chapel. In the letters which accompanied this remittance the British and Foreign Unitarian Association engaged to remit annually Sa. Rs. 1500 for the support of a Missionary, and Sa. Rs. 500 in aid of the Fund for General Purposes, the last mentioned contribution not to commence till the expiration of two years. The interest excited among the English Unitarians in favor of a Foreign Mission appears to be very general, embracing almost every congregation belonging to the denomination; the Unitarian periodical works advocate the cause of the Calcutta Mission; and sermons have been preached by some of the most distinguished ministers in furtherance of its objects. The correspondence on the part of the English Unitarians with this Committee has indeed been very tardy and irregular; but the sincere and general interest felt in the objects of a Foreign Mission is shown by the liberality of the pecuniary aid they have afforded, and by the number of individuals in different parts of the kingdom, whose subscriptions have contributed to swell the amount. The Committee are happy to state that, amongst others, Mr Belsham, the bosom friend and coadjutor of Dr Priestley and Mr Lindsey, with whose names his will be associated in the grateful recollection of every friend of pure Christianity, has lived to witness the commencement of a Unitarian Mission in India and to express his ardent aspirations for its success.

'The friends of Unitarian Christianity in India will perceive from the preceding statements, that the English and American Unitarians have adopted different plans in regard to foreign objects, the former having combined the prosecution of them with domestic objects by one and the same Association, and the latter having made them the business of a distinct Society. On the one hand there is a danger from the existence of two societies, one for domestic and the other for foreign objects, that an impression of opposition between them may be created, an effect which this Committee should deeply regret to witness, because they are convinced that the prosperity of the denomination in England and America will be the surest guarantee for the effectual prosecution of a Foreign

Mission, and that the success of a Foreign Mission will have a most beneficial influence upon the state and character of the denomination in those countries. On the other hand there is a danger from the multiplicity of the objects of one Society that details will be neglected, the evils of which the Committee, in communicating with their English brethren, have already had occasion seriously to lament. Each plan is probably best adapted to the circumstances of the denomination in the country where it has been adopted, and while the Committee venture to express the hope that the evils of both will be avoided, they gratefully acknowledge the liberal and generous aid which they have received from Unitarians both in England and America. It is true that they have not rushed with a rash and impetuous zeal into the business of Foreign Missions. Most of them were probably at first inimical or indifferent to the object; then they learned to call in question the grounds on which their hostility or apathy rested; they inquired and obtained information; they reflected on the facts placed before them and discussed the subject in public and in private, in conversation and by correspondence, from the press and in the pulpit; and finally they have acted with a zeal and liberality which are well fitted to encourage and stimulate Unitarians in India. It may be regretted that they did not sooner perceive the christian duty they owe to heathen countries; but none can justly reproach them for it, for, until within the last twenty or thirty years, nearly the whole Protestant church was equally neglectful of this high duty, and Unitarians even now have left some branches of that church behind them in this good work. It may be regretted that much valuable time has been lost, and that in the interval some friends to the cause of Unitarian Christianity in India have grown cold; but it could not be expected that English and American Unitarians would give their active support to a Foreign Mission before they were convinced of its practicability and utility, or that a few having been convinced that there was a probability of permanent good being done, they could at once carry the whole denomination along with them in this persuasion. Now, however, that a deep and general interest has been excited among English and American Unitarians in favor of a Mission in this country, Unitarians here, knowing that

their decision has been formed after serious and mature consideration, may depend on their zealous and persevering cooperation with a degree of confidence which could not previously have been possessed.

‘ Having thus secured the cooperation of those Christians in England and America who assume the distinctive appellation of Unitarians, the Committee propose to avail themselves of the opportunity afforded by the publication of this Report, to open a correspondence with the Presbyterians of Ireland many of whom are known to be Anti-Trinitarians, and with the Free-Thinking Christians in England who are all Unitarians—with the Unitarians at Geneva and in Transylvania on the continent of Europe—and with the Christian Connexion, the Society of Friends, and the Universalists in the United States of America, most of whom are stated to believe in the simple unity of God. Individuals belonging to several of these bodies of Christians have already written to some of the members of the Committee, and it is hoped that most of them will be disposed, according to their ability, to contribute their aid for the promotion of education in India under the superintendence and control of this Committee.

‘ II. *Employment of a Missionary.*—The first object accomplished by the united contributions of the English, American, and Calcutta Unitarians, is the permanent engagement of a person competent to act as a *Unitarian Minister and Missionary* by devoting the chief part of his time to the business of the Committee, conducting the local and foreign correspondence, and putting into execution or superintending measures for the promotion of religion and education on the spot. The individual employed for the performance of these duties is the Reverend William Adam, whose engagement with this Committee commenced from 1st May 1827. It has already been mentioned that the British and Foreign Unitarian Association have offered permanently to contribute for this purpose 1500 Rs. annually, and the American Society for the Promotion of Christianity in India, 600 dollars annually for ten years certain; and it is now to be added that this Committee have formed a Missionary Fund, and from the accruing interest have agreed permanently to contribute to the same object 125 Rs. per month, the salary derived from these

different sources amounting to about 350 Rs. per month. In consideration of the inadequacy of this salary to do more than afford subsistence to a European family without providing for their future wants, it has been expressly recognised by this Committee and the British and Foreign Association that Mr Adam is at liberty to devote a portion of his time to other than strictly religious pursuits, if they are not, in the judgment of this Committee incompatible with his Ministerial and Missionary character. Even the undivided labors of only one person cannot do full justice to the combined duties of Preacher to an English congregation and Missionary to the Heathen, especially as in the present case, where a Mission is not only to be carried on, but to be begun and its very foundations to be laid, and where, consequently, much of his time must be occupied in subordinate and preparatory details, and where, moreover, scarcely any are to be found who can spare even a small portion of leisure from their own professional engagements to aid in those details. The Committee therefore consider a coadjutor to Mr Adam highly desirable and indeed necessary to give efficiency to the Mission, and they earnestly hope that the exertions of the English and American Unitarians may be directed to supply this deficiency. In the mean time, it has been the endeavour of the Committee, in which Mr Adam has cordially concurred, to separate as much as possible the secular from the spiritual concerns of the Mission, to assign the care of the former exclusively to the other members of their own body, and to require from him only the appropriate and congenial duties of his station. The various sums received from England and America for Mr Adam’s personal use, before the commencement of his engagement, were placed by him at the disposal of the Committee, who have applied them to the other purposes of the Mission.

‘ III. *Chapel for English Worship.*—The next object contemplated by the Committee, was the erection of a Chapel for stated worship and instruction in the English language, a measure which they believe to be strongly recommended by the following considerations. 1. One of the best ways to convince others of the truth and excellence of Unitarian Christianity, is for its adherents and professors to show that they wish, not only others but themselves and their families,

to live under the influence of its pure and salutary principles. The number of Unitarians resident in Calcutta has been found greater than the most sanguine expectations had anticipated, and it is gradually increasing by the accession of individuals from all classes of society; and the number is also considerable of Unitarians who come from the other parts of India, or from foreign countries, and remain here a longer or a shorter time for purposes of business. Hitherto Unitarians in Calcutta, whether permanent residents or transient visitors, have had no public place of worship to which they could conscientiously resort, no stated means of religious culture, and it is surely desirable for their own sakes, without any reference to its effects upon others, that, to supply this want, a Unitarian Chapel should be built in Calcutta. It is high time that Unitarian Christians in India, forming a distinct class of Protestant Dissenters, neither few in number nor confined to a corner, should have a place of worship which they may call their own. 2. But the measure becomes still more important when viewed in connexion with the Unitarian Mission which has been commenced in Calcutta. The labors of one or more isolated individuals to make known Unitarian Christianity to the natives, will attract little attention, and exert scarcely any influence; and to act effectively therefore upon the native community it is essential that Unitarians should become a regularly organized religious body. The existence of such a body exhibited by a regular attendance upon the weekly services of religion, and distinguished from other christian sects by the exclusive worship of One God in One Person, would be a *fact* which could neither be overlooked nor denied, and which would alone tend to remove many prejudices from the minds of Christians, Mohummudans, and Hindoos; while the discourses delivered would furnish the professors of other denominations and those natives who understand the English language, which most respectable Hindoos of Calcutta now do, with a better opportunity of knowing what Unitarian Christianity is, than perhaps any other means that could be employed. Such a congregation would be like a focus from which the light of pure religion would emanate in many different directions; for, without seeking to transform private Christians into proselytizing zealots, even the silent example of

a firm, consistent, and public adherence to unpopular truth would alone essentially contribute to shake the foundations of error. Nor is it to be supposed that a congregation of Unitarian Christians would be indifferent to the employment of legitimate means for the diffusion of correct information respecting their religious sentiments. They would doubtless be willing according to their ability to aid the Committee with pecuniary means for prosecuting the objects of its institution; and the value or rather necessity of such aid will be duly appreciated when it is considered that Unitarians are without the pale of all other christian denominations, and enjoy none of that sympathy, assistance, or support which they mutually afford to each other. Every man's hand is against them. They must depend on themselves alone and draw their resources from their own body; and it is only through the medium of a stated and regular congregation that any permanent or considerable pecuniary aid can be derived from the Unitarians in this country. The Committee, convinced that without an appropriate place of their own for public worship, there will not be a permanent congregation, and that without a permanent congregation none of the advantages enumerated will be fully enjoyed, at an early date opened a subscription for the erection of a Unitarian Chapel in Calcutta. The amount subscribed in Calcutta is Sa. Rs. 13,033 9 9, but not more than half of that sum has actually been paid; a sum of Sa. Rs. 14,029 8, has been received from the British and Foreign Association, being the amount of the English subscriptions; besides £20 sent direct by Mr Freme, as already mentioned, and added to the Chapel Fund, and a sum of 100 dollars sent by Brattle Square Church Society in Boston, as formerly stated, which has been appropriated in the same way. With part of these funds a piece of ground consisting of one beegah and four cottahs has been purchased for 12,378 Rs. and vested in Trustees for the use of Unitarian Christians in Calcutta; and the remainder of the funds is in the hands of the Treasurer of the Committee. If the Calcutta subscriptions remaining unpaid were received, and an equal amount of additional subscriptions obtained, the Committee would commence the erection of the Chapel with some degree of confidence that they would be able to complete it, although even that sum

they consider would be insufficient to furnish it for public worship. The English Unitarians have subscribed far more liberally to this object than could have been reasonably expected of them, and the Committee therefore earnestly call the attention of the Unitarian public in India and America to the deficiency of the funds applicable to this purpose and to the importance of carrying into early execution this long pending measure. Every one who is desirous of giving permanence, consistence, and efficiency to a Unitarian Mission in this country will subscribe to the Chapel Fund. It is to this one point, after defraying contingent expenses, that all the pecuniary contributions of Unitarian Christians in aid of a Mission in India should be at this time directed, and the Committee therefore limit their call for pecuniary aid to this single object, and anxiously hope that its importance may not be overlooked.

Until sufficient funds shall be obtained for the erection of a Chapel, the Committee have sought to gain the advantages of one by commencing Unitarian worship and instruction in a hired place. This has been done on two different occasions, first in 1821-22, and more recently during the present year. The first attempt was attended with an encouraging degree of success; but it was finally abandoned in consequence of Mr Adam having been placed under the necessity of engaging in a secular occupation for the support of his family. Since his relinquishment of that occupation and his resumption of the Missionary and Ministerial character, public worship, on the principles of Unitarian Christianity, has been recommenced at the Hurkaru Public Rooms. The form of worship employed is that of the Church of England, the Committee having adopted the Common Prayer Book used at the Unitarian Chapel in Essex Street, of which they commissioned a number to be sent, and have lately received 125 copies presented gratis by a member of the Unitarian body in London. The attendance at the Morning Service from the beginning of August to the end of October varied from ten to thirty individuals; and that at the Evening Service, which was substituted for it, has varied from fifty to eighty, which, compared with the average attendance at all Dissenting Chapels and at some Churches in Calcutta, the Committee regard as a pleasing indication of a desire on the part of a numerous and

respectable portion of the community to be correctly informed respecting the doctrines of Unitarian Christianity. The subject of the Evening Lectures which are still in the course of delivery, is the Doctrine of the Unity of God considered in its various relations both to Trinitarianism and to Polytheism and Idolatry; and the Committee are happy to add that the endeavours used to draw the public attention to this great truth have, they believe, been materially aided by the discourses of Trinitarian Divines intended to counteract the effects of the Lectures delivered at the Hurkaru Rooms. A considerable proportion of the congregation that assembles, besides several respectable and intelligent natives, consists of individuals who could not conscientiously, and therefore did not in fact, regularly attend any other place of worship; and, although none of course are excluded, yet the further accessions that are expected belong principally to the same class. They have not been drawn from other churches and chapels, and their attendance, therefore, on Unitarian Christian worship even in the estimation of the most hostile must be considered a clear gain to society and to the cause of Christianity. All who are desirous of promoting national religion and pure Christianity are invited to give their attendance at Unitarian worship where it is now conducted, and in the mean time the Committee will make every exertion to obtain funds by which they may be enabled to commence and complete the Chapel for the better accommodation of the public. The expense incurred by the maintenance of public worship amounts to upwards of 150 Rupees per month, including rent, &c., and is defrayed from the Fund for General or Contingent expenses which has been formed partly by public subscriptions and partly by remittances from England.

IV. Native Service.—In the First Memoir the delivery of *Familiar Lectures* on religion in the native language and in the native parts of the city was contemplated, and the Committee still think this an object of great importance. By means of a Native Service, respectable and educated Hindoos will have an opportunity of acquiring plain and intelligible views of religion in general and of Christianity in particular; such a service will form a point of union between Christian and Hindoo Unitarians against

polytheism and idolatry; and even if no conversions are made, which indeed are not anticipated as the primary effects of the Committee's exertions, yet the stated inculcation of moral and religious obligations on rational principles, cannot but be attended with beneficial consequences both to individuals and to society. With these views a Native Service was commenced in October last and is still continued every Sunday morning. The order of the Service consists in offering a short extempore prayer; examining those who are present on the subject of the preceding Lecture; delivering another Discourse in continuation, and again joining together in a concluding prayer, after which every one is at liberty either to advance objections to what has been stated or to ask for further information. It was at first intended to conduct the service in the Bengalee language, but this was strongly objected to by the native members of the Committee, on the ground that the natives are not accustomed to use the vernacular tongue as a medium of instruction on literary and religious subjects, and that if an attempt were made to teach religion in Bengalee, the subject would be degraded and despised in consequence of the medium employed. They recommended the use of the English language, which the majority of intelligent Hindoos in Calcutta can understand, and in which they would consider it a mark of respect to be addressed. The English language, therefore, is principally although not exclusively employed in the Native Service; but it is designed gradually to introduce the use of the Bengalee to a greater extent, for the Committee are satisfied that if Bengal is ever to be enlightened, either by religion or science, it must be through the medium of the vernacular dialect. The Bengalee language is obtaining increased attention from the natives themselves, and no one has contributed more than a learned native member of this Committee to elevate its character, purify its idioms, and recommend it as a medium of scientific and religious communication to his countrymen. The prejudice, however, against the Bengalee, is still so strong, and the rage for learning English so high, that the adoption of the latter at present, although not to the entire exclusion of the former, is deemed expedient; but the Committee are far from considering

that the English language is the most proper medium for communicating knowledge to the great body of the people, however valuable an acquaintance with it may be to some as an accomplishment, or to others as a means of subsistence, and however important it may be to train up a limited number to a full and accurate knowledge of it, to be afterwards employed as the instructors of their countrymen.

With regard to the course of instruction commenced and intended to be pursued, it may be remarked in general, that Missionary preaching has produced an effect on the minds of the natives upon the whole unfavorable to Christianity. It has excited prejudice, suspicion, jealousy against everything Christian. The utmost caution, therefore, must be exercised by the Unitarian Missionary, and his principal endeavours must be directed to lessen or remove this hostile bias. Instead of forcing Christianity on the attention of a congregation of intelligent Hindoos without reference to their age, dispositions, opinions, and degree of mental cultivation—which would be nothing less than a proclamation to them to disperse—it must be his object to produce a favorable state of *feeling* towards Christians and Christianity, without which the clearest evidence will make no impression and the most undoubted truths will find no resting place in the mind. With this view an attempt has been made, by plain arguments and familiar illustrations, to prove, explain, and enforce the being and attributes of God, his providence and moral government, and the various duties resulting from those doctrines, but without introducing Christianity; while at the same time Mr Adam has distinctly stated that he is a Christian, that his object is to promote Christianity, and that he will be happy to afford any information respecting it, that may be required of him. Hereafter, according as he finds his audience competent and willing to enter into such an investigation, he may deliver a separate course of Familiar Lectures on the comparative merits and demerits, excellences and defects of every system of Religion which professes to be a Divine Revelation,—Judaism, Mohummudanism, Hindooism, and Christianity,—leaving every one to come to a decision for himself; and in a state of more advanced preparation,

he may dwell at greater length on the Evidences, the Doctrines, and the Duties of the Christian Religion. Since the commencement of this Native Service the congregation has varied from 12 to 25, and although it is a matter of regret that so few of those Hindoos who have rejected idolatry appear disposed to give their countenance to the public worship of One God, yet the respectability, intelligence, and seriousness even of this small congregation, are very encouraging circumstances, and will, it is hoped, lead to a more general public profession of religion by Hindoo Unitarians. All the individuals composing it understand English, and almost all have received an English education. They attend from Sunday to Sunday at a fixed time and place, of their own accord, without any other motive or inducement but the desire to receive religious instruction. Throughout the service they join with reverence in the prayers addressed to God and listen with attention to the instructions delivered. And the occasional essays or abstracts which they prepare of the Discourses they have heard, the pertinent answers which they generally give when examined, and the further inquiries they make on the subject which has been treated, show that they both comprehend what has been said to them, and that they take a deep interest in it. Mr Adam, however, regrets that his other indispensable engagements have permitted him to give only a very limited degree of attention to this Native Service and to native labors generally, and grounds on this fact a strong appeal for a coadjutor in his Missionary and Ministerial duties. The place of meeting is one of the apartments in the range of buildings occupied by Ram-mohun Roy's Anglo-Hindoo School in that quarter of the city called Simlyah.

It is very ill adapted to the purposes of public worship and instruction; but the Committee have reason to believe that the natives who attend the service, contemplate opening a subscription amongst themselves and their friends for the purchase of ground and the erection of a Native Chapel, to be appropriated to the worship of the One Living and True God.' (To be continued.)

Installation at Charlton.—The Rev. Edward Turner was on Wednesday, June 18th, installed as pastor of the First Congregational Church and Society in Charlton. Introductory Prayer, by the Rev. Mr Noyes, of Brookfield; Reading of the Scriptures, by the Rev. Mr Alden, of Marlborough; Sermon, by the Rev. Mr Walker, of Charlestown; Installation Prayer, by the Rev. Mr Huntoon, of Canton; Charge, by the Rev. Mr Thompson, of Barre; Right Hand of Fellowship, by the Rev. Mr May, of Brooklyn, Conn.; Concluding Prayer, by the Rev. Mr Osgood, of Sterling.

Installation at Salisbury and Amesbury.—On Wednesday, June 25th, the Rev. David Damon was installed as pastor of the Congregational Church and Society in Salisbury and Amesbury. Introductory Prayer, by the Rev. Mr Osgood, of Sterling; Selections from Scripture, by the Rev. Mr Loring, of Andover; Sermon, by the Rev. Dr Thayer, of Lancaster; Prayer of Installation, by the Rev. Dr Andrews, of Newburyport; Charge, by the Rev. Dr Parker, of Portsmouth; Right Hand of Fellowship, by the Rev. Mr Lincoln, of Fitchburg; Address to the Society, by the Rev. Dr Flint, of Salem; Concluding Prayer, by the Rev. Dr Lowell, of Boston.

VIEW OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS.

RUSSIA AND TURKEY.—The emperor of Russia has undertaken the war against Turkey with great vigor. He has employed more than 300,000 men in this service, and has followed in person the movements of the main army. This army has crossed the Danube, and after taking several towns and fortresses

of some importance, has advanced to the Balkan mountains, and laid siege to Chumla, a strong and populous town which guards one of the passes of the mountains, and also to Varna a town on the coast of the Black sea. A division of the army has captured Brailow, after an obstinate siege, and a bloody assault,

and another division has advanced to Silistria, and begun the siege of that fortress. Two Russian armies have entered Asiatic Turkey, and begun their conquests there. One of them crossed the Kouban, on the eastern side of the sea of Asoph, and by the aid of a fleet from the Crimea, has captured Anapa, a strong town with a Turkish garrison, in Great Abazia. The other army, which had lately effected the conquest of two Persian provinces, has entered Turkish Armenia, from the side of Persia, taken Kars by storm, and at the date of the last accounts, was threatening Erzerum, the principal town in that quarter of Turkey. The accounts from Constantinople, in regard both to the efforts made for the defence of the country, and the advances towards negotiation with the allied powers, are somewhat contradictory. The prevalent tenor of these accounts, however, is, that the spirit of the people seems to be broken, and that there is very little enthusiasm in the efforts which are made for the national defence. The ambassadors of Great Britain, France, and Russia, were on the point of meeting at Corfu, for the purpose of negotiating on the affairs of Turkey, and it was reported that the Turkish government had agreed to accede to the terms of the treaty of London, of July 6, as a condition of the mediation of the allied powers in terminating the present controversy.

GREECE.—Ibrahim Pacha has entered into a stipulation with the admirals of the combined squadron of the allied powers, to evacuate the Morea, and to return to Egypt with all his army, as soon as transports for that purpose can be procured from Alexandria. A messenger has been sent to demand these, and the evacuation was expected to take place about the 1st of September. The Turkish troops which were in possession of the fortresses, were not included in the stipulation, and they would continue to hold those places. It was expressly stipulated, that Ibrahim should take away no prisoners, but that all Greeks held in captivity in the Morea should be set at liberty. Ibrahim declined negotiating for the restoration of the prisoners who have been carried to Egypt and sold into servitude, but it is stated that an agent is to be sent by the French government, accompanied by a naval force, to demand

of the viceroy of Egypt, the restoration of all those prisoners. A military expedition has been fitted out in France, a part of which, consisting of about 8000 men, sailed from Toulon in August, for the Morea, to free from the foot of the enemy, such parts of that country as are yet held by the Turks. It is expected that one of the first acts of the Ambassadors at Corfu, will be to prescribe the limits of the new Grecian state, and that they will make other arrangements for determining the character of the government and ensuring the tranquillity of the country. Count Capo d'Istria had received pecuniary aids from some of the allied powers, and he expected them from others. He had made some progress in organizing the departments of the government, but all efforts which had been made in military enterprises had been feeble, and had not been attended with any brilliant success.

PORTUGAL.—An assembly, convoked by Don Miguel as the Three Estates of the kingdom, has declared him the lawful sovereign. He has therefore assumed the exercise of absolute authority, in his own right, and independently of the Constitution, which he had previously, in the capacity of Regent, sworn to support. The whole kingdom has submitted to this usurpation. The inhabitants of Oporto, with many distinguished individuals in other parts of the kingdom, for a short time endeavoured to maintain the Constitution and to resist the invasion of their rights, and of those of their lawful sovereign; but the party of Don Miguel was found too strong to be resisted. The Constitutional army suddenly dispersed, Oporto was occupied by the troops of the usurper, many of the Constitutionals fled into Spain and other countries, and great numbers have been thrown into prison, and have suffered the most grievous persecution. The government of Madeira maintains its allegiance to its lawful sovereign and to the Constitution, and has sent back to Portugal the new governor, appointed by Don Miguel. A military and naval force is fitting out at Lisbon, to reduce this island to submission. The Azores have acknowledged Don Miguel, and received their new governor.

SOUTH AMERICA.—The war be-

tween Brazil and Buenos Ayres still continues, but it is prosecuted languidly. Negotiations for peace were still pending, at the last dates from Rio Janeiro, but with little prospect of a successful result. The republic of Colombia has thrown herself unreservedly into the arms of Bolivar, who has thrown aside the forms of the Constitution, and undertaken to administer the government according to his discretion. He has also declared war against Peru, which country had committed the double offence, of throwing off the yoke imposed upon them by him, and of sending an army into Upper Peru, to relieve the

people of that country from the military government which he had established there, under the name of Bolivia. The city of Lima suffered severely on the 30th of March last, from a terrific earthquake, which destroyed a great number of churches and other buildings, and cut off many lives. In Central America, at the date of the last accounts, the two hostile parties had agreed to the conditions of a peace, but some difficulty arose, on the part of one of the commanding generals, in ratifying the treaty. We are yet to learn whether the country has been restored to a state of tranquillity.

OBITUARY.

DIED, in this city, July 7, HENRY HILL, Esq. aged 91.

Mr Hill possessed traits of character, which deserve to be remembered and imitated. He was a religious man; not fanatical or superstitious, but reverent and devout. His piety was not an austere, gloomy, repulsive principle, but a calm, cheerful, happy emotion. It was a feeling of reverence for the divine character, of submission to the divine will, of respect for the divine laws. Those who only saw him occasionally and of course knew him but superficially, might have concluded that a heart so light and playful, could not have been the residence of any deep and serious feeling. But they knew not the man. If piety consists in melancholy and gloom, then he had no just claim to the virtue. But if it consists in an habitual sense of God's presence and inspection, in reverence of his character, in gratitude for his mercies, in resignation to his appointments, and in an observance of all the ordinances of religion and means of grace, then he had a claim to the character of a religious man. Contentment dwelt in his bosom, and the accents of praise and thankfulness to God were ever upon his lips. 'His enjoyments,' he was accustomed to say, 'had been many; his pains and afflictions few.' While recounting the gifts and mercies of providence, he would exclaim, 'I have been one of the happiest of men; I have had everything to make me so;

the best of friends, and the best of all God's blessings.' He was remarkable, too, for his equanimity and patience. It was difficult to ruffle his temper, or disturb the uniform tranquillity of his mind. He bore suffering and affliction, as a Christian should bear them, without a repining thought or a complaining word. Lying as he did for many months, feeble and helpless, he exemplified, in his last sickness, some of the finest traits of the christian character, and taught all around him a lesson of patience, of contentment and of gratitude, which will never be forgotten. He was a kind hearted and benevolent man. His charity beginning at home, his numerous relatives found in him at all times a steady friend and unfailing benefactor. Under his hospitable roof they found a joyful welcome—and many who had no claims of brotherhood found there a peaceful asylum.

Of his habits of life, I think it useful and proper to mention his unparalleled temperance. It was a temperance so habitual and complete, that some would denominate it abstemiousness. It was an abstinence, too, not merely from excess in one particular, but in all. During a long life he abjured altogether the use of distilled liquors, and ever rose from his table with an unsated appetite, and consequently with a clear head and a tranquil mind. Difficult as it is to determine with certainty the causes of longevity, there can be little doubt that the deceased was es-

entially aided in reaching so advanced an age, by his uniform equanimity and temperance. Having no anxiety of mind, and cherishing within him none of the common causes of disease, he lived on without any violent shock being offered to his system; and when he fell away, it was the inevitable decay of nature, the ruin of mortality. He was a healthy, active, vigorous man for upwards of ninety years, because he was at peace with God and his own conscience, and because he never transgressed the bounds of moderation. The result was, the singular fact, that he never summoned a physician to his aid, and never permitted one to approach him, in his professional capacity.

As to his religious sentiments, Mr Hill was a decided Unitarian. Educated a Trinitarian and a Calvinist, he was led by the study of the bible alone, to embrace a more just and liberal theology. Familiar with the scriptures, and well acquainted with the arguments of the controversy, he took delight in avowing and vindicating the simple truths of Unitarian Christianity. He understood religion too well, and felt it too deeply, to be exclusive and bigoted. He was remarkable for his tolerance and charity. When inquiring the character of an individual, he never thought of asking what were his theological opinions, or at what church he worshipped; but his sole question was, 'Is he good? Has he the christian spirit?' In his own family, persons of different religious persuasions lived together for years in harmony and peace; and he was accustomed to speak of this as a delightful evidence that true and genuine religion may be found everywhere, among all sects—that religion which 'is peaceable, gentle, easy to be entreated, full of mercy and good fruits, without partiality, and without hypocrisy.'

The principles of Unitarian Christianity, which occupied his mind and heart in health and in prosperity, cheered him in the time of affliction, and supported him when on the bed of

sickness and in the near prospect of death. His trust was in the free love and unpurchased mercy of his heavenly Father, as they are revealed to us by his blessed Son. He had no ecstasies and no raptures in his last hours, but he looked forward with a tranquil and humble hope, to the time of his departure.

Such was the life, such was the death, of this excellent old man. He lived long and he lived well. He has now gone to his fathers in peace. He has been 'buried in a good old age.' To his relatives and his numerous friends he has left behind him pleasant recollections and consoling hopes.

'Why mourn ye that our aged friend is dead?

Ye are not sad to see the gathered grain,
Nor when their mellow fruit the orchards cast,
Nor when the yellow woods shake down the
ripened mast.

'Ye sigh not when the sun, his course fulfilled,
His glorious course, rejoicing earth and sky,
In the soft evening, when the winds are stilled,
Sinks where his islands of refreshment lie,
And leaves the smile of his departure spread,
O'er the warm colored heaven, and ruddy moun-
tain head.

'Why weep ye then for him, who, having run
The bound of man's appointed years, at last,
Life's blessings all enjoyed, life's labor done,
Serenely to his final rest has passed;
While the soft memory of his virtues, yet
Lingers like twilight hues, when the bright sun
is set.

'His youth was innocent; his riper age
Marked with some act of goodness every day;
And watched by eyes that loved him, calm and
sage,
Faded his late declining years away.
Cheerful he gave his being up, and went
To share the holy rest that waits a life well
spent.

'That life was happy; every day he gave
Thanks for the fair existence that was his;
For a sick fancy made not him her slave,
'To mock him with her phantom miseries.
No chronic tortures racked his aged limb,
For luxury and sloth had nourished none for
him.

'And I am glad, that he has lived thus long,
And glad that he has gone to his reward;
Nor deem that kindly nature did him wrong,
Softly to disengage the vital cord.
When his weak hand grew palsied, and his eye
Dark with the mists of age, it was his time to die.'

Bryant.

THE CASKET:

AN ANNUAL FOR CHILDREN AND YOUNG PERSONS, FOR THE
YEAR 1829.

BOWLES & DEARBORN have in press, and will publish about the fifteenth of this month, THE CASKET, for 1829, intended for a Christmas and New Year's Present, to Children and Youth.

The Casket will be similar in its plan to other American and English Annuals,—containing the following original pieces in Prose and Verse.

The Water-Spirit,
Stanzas, "Sweet flower," &c.
Sonnet, (with a plate,)
To the Coronella,
Cecilia—a drama,
Serenade,
Blanche of Castile, (with a plate,)
To the Spirit of Joy,
To a Daisy,
Lines suggested by reading "Early Impressions,"
Aglæa, a fairy tale,
Evergreens,
To a Lady,
Upon a Flower,
Thoughts,

The Two Portraits, (with a plate,)
Stanzas, "I love to see," &c.
Stanzas, suggested by a painting,
Stanzas, "The young, the lovely,"
&c.
To the Skylark, (with a plate,)
To the memory of Franklin,
On Mount Vernon,
Reason and Religion,
Flowers,
The Garden of Roses,
Samuel, (with a plate,)
The Youth of Madame Roland,
To Mrs Hemans,
The dying Babe, (with a plate.)

The Plates, seven in number, will be executed on copper, by the first artists.

The Casket will be bound in a plain, neat style, without cases—so that it may not only answer for a Christmas and New Year's Gift, but also have a place in Juvenile Libraries, &c.

The Casket is offered to the Booksellers on terms as liberal as other similar works published in this country. The retail price will be \$1.50.

Orders are respectfully solicited.

THE LIBERAL PREACHER.

I. 'On Christ's sense of Dependence on God, particularly as shown in his Intercessory Office,' by Rev. John Pierpont, Boston, Mass.

II. 'On the Divine Influence, in the Conversion of Sinners,' by Rev. John Foster, D. D. Brighton, Mass.

TERMS.

1. A number is published the first week of every month, and will contain one long, or two shorter sermons.—2. Price One Dollar a year—(exclusive of postage) to be paid in advance.—3. Five or more persons uniting, and forwarding their subscriptions, may receive the work for the year at eighty cents.—4. Applications to be addressed (post paid) to either of the Publishers, JOHN PRENTISS, *Keene, N. H.* or BOWLES & DEARBORN, *Boston.*

LIVES OF THE APOSTLES.

For sale by Hilliard, Gray, & Co. Boston, LIVES OF THE TWELVE APOSTLES; with Explanatory Notes. By F. W. P. Greenwood, Junior Minister of King's Chapel, Boston.

BOOKS

FOR SALE

BY HILLIARD & BROWN,

BOOKSELLERS TO THE UNIVERSITY, CAMBRIDGE.

- Griesbach's New Testament, 2 vols. 8vo. 3d critical edition. Edited by Schultz. Berlin, 1827.
- Taylor's Concordance, fol. cf. 2 vols. in one.
- Walchii Bibliotheca Theologica, 6 vols. 8vo. half cf.
- Spanheim. Op. om. 3 vols. fol. parchment.
- Lardner's Works, 5 vols. 4to. London.
- Massillon's " complete, 13 vols. 8vo. Paris.
- Flecher's " " 11 " " " "
- Herder's " 32 " 12mo. half cf. gilt. Carlschrue, 1818.
- Sismondi's Hist. of Italian Republics, 16 vols. 8vo. Paris.
- " " Literature of South of Europe, 4 vols. 8vo. Paris.
- " " France, 9 " " "
- Rollin's Complete Works, 30 " " "
- Dictionary of the Spanish Academy, 4to. best ed.
- " French " 2 vols. 4to.
- " " " Supplement to. vol. 1. 4to.
- La Harpe's Course of Literature, 16 vols.
- Crabbe's Historical Dictionary, 2 vols. 4to. London.
- " Technological do. " " "
- Bacon's Work's complete, 10 vols. 8vo. "
- Locke's " " 9 " " cf. "
- Gibbon's Rome, 12 " " "
- Hume and Smollett's England, 13 vols. "
- Byron's Works, 4 vols. 8vo. London, Murray.
- " " 5 " 12mo. " "
- " " 1 " 8vo. Paris.
- " " 10 " 18mo. "
- Clarendon's History of the Rebellion, 8 vols. London.
- Paley's Works complete, last ed. 7 vols. 8vo. "
- Wharton's History of English Poetry, 4 " "
- Johnson's Complete Works, 12 " 8vo. "
- Calvin's Institutes, translated by Norton, fol. cf. 1634, London.
- H. & B. have most of the neat editions of Sharpe, Whittingham, and Dow's Classics—Jones's Editions of do.—Christian Cabinet Library, &c. &c.—Didot's cheap French Editions, at very reduced prices.—Tunckmitz's and Weigel's Latin and Greek Classics.—Bipont Editions of many of the Latin Classics, &c. &c. &c.

A NEW DICTIONARY FOR SCHOOLS.

BENJAMIN PERKINS & CO. BOSTON,

HAVE JUST PUBLISHED,

JOHNSON'S DICTIONARY, IMPROVED BY TODD, ABRIDGED FOR THE USE OF SCHOOLS; WITH THE ADDITION OF WALKER'S PRONUNCIATION; AN ABSTRACT OF HIS PRINCIPLES OF ENGLISH PRONUNCIATION, WITH QUESTIONS; A VOCABULARY OF GREEK, LATIN, AND SCRIPTURE PROPER NAMES; AND AN APPENDIX OF AMERICANISMS.

'It is almost universally acknowledged, among learned men, that the definitions in Johnson's Dictionary are superior to all others; and it is also conceded, that Walker's pronunciation is, with few exceptions, the proper standard. A Dictionary, in which the excellences of these two authors are combined, must, therefore, be the best adapted to the present state of the English language.

'A very valuable work has been executed on this plan, and lately published in Boston. It is entitled "Johnson's and Walker's English Dictionaries combined," and contains all the words which have been added to Johnson's Dictionary by Dr Todd. The following is an Abridgement of this work."

'The Appendix of Americanisms will assist the scholar in detecting the words in common use, which are not well authorized, and will show him the difference between English and American usage.

'The Principles of Pronunciation, which follow this Preface, are selected almost entirely from Walker's Dictionary. It is not common to study these Principles in our schools; and, hence, Dictionaries are very imperfectly understood. The Editor earnestly recommends that they should be studied thoroughly and frequently by every scholar who can understand them; and that teachers should require them to be applied to every lesson from the Dictionary.

'To render these Principles intelligible and interesting, and to impress them on the memories of pupils, they are accompanied in this Abridgement with suitable QUESTIONS. These will be found a valuable improvement; and it is hoped that, on the whole, this Dictionary for Schools possesses more excellences, and fewer faults, than any that has been offered to the public.'—*Preface.*

'The publishers of this Dictionary believe it to be decidedly superior to any other School Dictionary before the public. 'The selection of words is very copious, and the definitions and notation are given with great plainness and accuracy.' The lessons in the principles of Pronunciation with Questions, and the Vocabulary of Americanisms are peculiar to this abridgement, and are by competent judges thought to be of great value. It is the intention of the publishers that the work shall be uniformly good in its mechanical execution, and the price low. They respectfully invite teachers and all who are interested in the subject of education to examine the work.

A GREEK AND ENGLISH DICTIONARY.

HILLIARD, GRAY, LITTLE, AND WILKINS, BOSTON,

HAVE JUST PUBLISHED,

A GREEK AND ENGLISH DICTIONARY, COMPRISING ALL THE WORDS IN THE WRITINGS OF THE MOST POPULAR GREEK AUTHORS ; WITH THE DIFFICULT INFLECTIONS IN THEM AND IN THE SEPTUAGINT AND NEW TESTAMENT : DESIGNED FOR THE USE OF SCHOOLS AND THE UNDER-GRADUATE COURSE OF A COLLEGIATE EDUCATION. BY THE REV. JOHN GROVES. WITH CORRECTIONS AND ADDITIONAL MATTER, BY THE AMERICAN EDITOR.

EXTRACTS FROM THE PREFACE.

THE object of the compiler of this work was to offer to the public a DICTIONARY, which young Greek scholars could use with ease and advantage to themselves ; but sufficiently full to be equally serviceable as they advanced ; a Book that would answer for School, for College, and more particularly for reading the New Testament and the Septuagint.

To give English significations for Greek words is the original principle on which this Dictionary was compiled. The surprising ease with which very young boys understood the Gospels, with the assistance of Parkhurst's Dictionary,—suggested the commencement of this work.

In the arrangement of the words, the alphabetical method has been adopted as best suited to the capacity and diligence of the young learner. In this respect, and in some others, this Dictionary resembles the Greek and Latin Lexicon of Schrevelius, for a long time used in schools. The outline of the plan of each is very similar ; but this differs from Schrevelius in many particulars, some of which it is hoped will appear to be improvements.

Immediately after each word is placed its form of declension or conjugation, together with any peculiarity attending it ; such as the Attic genitive of contracted nouns, the future or perfect of any dialect peculiar to certain verbs, &c.

Next is placed the derivation or composition of the word. Particular attention has been paid to this part of the work.

The English significations of the Greek word follow next. These have been selected from a careful comparison of the Latin of Stephens' Thesaurus, Scapula, Damm, Schleusner, and in many instances, other Lexicons have been consulted with advantage.

After the significations are subjoined, any irregularities or varieties arising from dialect, &c. and some of the more difficult inflections of each word are added.

Such is a sketch of the mode of arrangements pursued.

The type is clear and distinct, having been cast for the work ; and the paper is better than what is generally used for such books.

WORKS FOR SALE BY HILLIARD & BROWN.

NEW WORKS,
FOR SALE BY HILLIARD & BROWN,

A GRAMMAR OF THE HEBREW LANGUAGE. By MOSES STUART, Professor of Sacred Literature in the Theological Institution at Andover. 3d ed. 8vo.

The Philosophy of the Active and Moral Powers of Man. By Dugald Stewart. 2 vols. 8vo.

Records of Women. By Mrs Hemans. 18vo.

Burke's Works, complete in 7 vols. 8vo.

Worcester's Epitome of History and Charts. This book is intended for the use of common schools, and is highly recommended in our best journals, and by our most experienced instructors. 4000 copies have been sold within the past year, and the demand for it is constantly increasing. Price of the History and Charts, \$1.00, with the usual discount to those who purchase by the quantity.

Bachi's Italian Reader. 12mo.

Questions to Adam's Roman Antiquities. 18mo.

Watson's Apology for the Bible.

Bishop Heber's Travels in India.

" " Poems.

" " Hymns.

Kenrick's Exposition, vols. 1 and 2. 8vo.

Walshe's Journal from Constantinople to England. 12mo.

Neele's Romance of the History of England. 2 vols. 12mo.

IN PRESS,

DUGALD STEWART'S COMPLETE WORKS.

Hilliard & Brown have just put to press the complete Works of Dugald Stewart, and will publish them as early as is compatible with a due regard to the accuracy of the printing. The Moral Philosophy will be comprised in two volumes and is now in press. Either of the works will be sold separately.

A full account of the edition, with the terms of subscription, &c. &c. will shortly be given by the Editor.

RAMMOHUN ROY'S WORKS.

Recently published, at the office of the Christian Register, and sold at the bookstores generally, the Theological Writings of RAMMOHUN ROY, the celebrated Hindoo Brahmin.

These works consist of '*The Precepts of Jesus, a Guide to Peace and Happiness*,' and of the '*First, Second, and Final Appeals to the Christian Public*,' in reply to the Observations of DR MARSHMAN of Serampore.

AGENTS

FOR THE

CHRISTIAN EXAMINER.

BOWLES & DEARBORN,

NO. 50, WASHINGTON STREET,—BOSTON.

MAINE.

PORTLAND,	James Adams, Jr.
SACO,	Putnam & Blake.
HALLOWELL,	C. Spaulding.
BELFAST,	E. T. Morrill.
AUGUSTA,	H. Spaulding.
BANGOR,	B. F. Nourse.
EASTPORT,	B. Folsom.

NEW HAMPSHIRE.

PORTSMOUTH,	J. W. Foster.
EXETER,	F. Grant.
DOVER,	S. C. Stevens.
KEENE,	John Prentiss.
CONCORD,	J. B. Moore.

VERMONT.

BURLINGTON,	C. Goodrich.
-------------	--------------

MASSACHUSETTS.

CAMBRIDGE,	Hilliard & Brown.
CONCORD,	J. Stacy.
SALEM,	{ J. R. Buffum.
	{ Whipple & Lawrence.
NEWBURYPORT,	Charles Whipple.
NEW BEDFORD,	William Howe.
NANTUCKET,	John Thornton.
LANCASTER,	H. & G. Carter.
GROTON,	A. Richardson.
WORCESTER,	C. Harris.
SPRINGFIELD,	Elisha Edwards.
NORTHAMPTON,	Simeon Butler.
BELCHERTON,	Warren & Wilson.

RHODE ISLAND.

PROVIDENCE,	G. Dana.
-------------	----------

CONNECTICUT.

NEW HAVEN,	H. Howe.
HARTFORD,	H. & F. J. Huntington

NEW YORK.

ALBANY,	C. Steele & Son.
NEW YORK,	C. S. Francis.
TRENTON,	Isaac B. Pierce.
CANANDAIGUA,	J. D. Bemis, & Co.

PENNSYLVANIA.

PHILADELPHIA,	R. H. Small.
PITTSBURG,	Johnson & Stockton.

MARYLAND.

BALTIMORE,	E. J. Cole.
------------	-------------

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

WASHINGTON,	P. Thompson.
-------------	--------------

VIRGINIA.

RICHMOND,	J. H. & T. Nash
-----------	-----------------

OHIO.

CINCINNATI,	E. H. Flint.
-------------	--------------

NORTH CAROLINA.

RALEIGH,	J. Gales & Son.
----------	-----------------

SOUTH CAROLINA.

CHARLESTON,	Thomas Cousins.
COLUMBIA,	J. W. Arthur.

GEORGIA.

AUGUSTA,	Thos. S. Metcalf.
SAVANNAH,	H. Ely.

All Communications whatever, relating to this work, *excepting such as pertain to the payment of subscriptions and the settling of accounts*, are to be directed to THE EDITOR OF THE CHRISTIAN EXAMINER, BOSTON.

All *payments* are to be made to, and all *accounts* settled with BOWLES & DEARBORN, 50 Washington Street, Boston.

The work will be sent *by mail*, to any part of the United States, on the remittance of one year's subscription (three dollars) to Bowles & Dearborn, Boston, or to any other agent,—subscribers paying postage, and taking the risk of conveyance.

The subscription becomes due on the publication of the second number, that is, on the 20th of April. Distant subscribers are expected to transmit the amount of their yearly subscription as soon as they receive the second number of each year.